

No Evidence
FOR
Diocesan Churches,
OR, ANY
BISHOPS
WITHOUT
The Choice or Consent of the PEOPLE,
IN THE
Primitive Times.

OR,
AN ANSWER to the Allegations out of
Antiquity for such Churches, and against Popular
Elections of Bishops: In a late Volume, Intitu-
led, *The Unreasonableness of Separation*:

SHEWING,
That they do not serve the Design for which they
are Produced.

Daniel Clark sen

The Episcopal men will hardly find any Evidence in Scripture, or the Practice of the Apostles, for Churches consisting of many fixed Congregations for Worship, under the Charge of one Person; nor in the Primitive Church, for the Ordination of a Bishop, without the preceding Election of the Clergy, and at least consent and approbation of the People. Dr. St. Iren. p. 416.

London, Printed for Thomas Parkhurst at the Bible and Threes Crowns in Cheap-side, near Mercers-Chappel, 1681.

No Evidence

FOR

Episcopal Churches.

OR ANY

BISHOPS

WITHOUT

The Consent of the People

IN THE

Primitive Times

OF

An A. N. S. W. E. R. to the Allegations one of

Advocates for such Churches, and against the

Electors of Bishops: in a Letter from

the Rev. Dr. John C. Calhoun.

SHewing

That they do not leave the Design for which they

are Produced.

The Bishop of London, who has lately and openly avowed his
Power of the Bishop, for Churchmen, consisting of many false
Statements, in his History, under the charge of one Person; not in
the Primitive Church, for the Ordination of a Bishop, without the
preceding Election of the Clergy, and at least consent and appro-
bation of the People. D. N. 1801. p. 416.

LONDON: Printed for Thomas Paine, at the Bible and Three Crowns
in Great Street, near St. Dunstons Church, 1801.

AN
ADVERTISEMENT

THE Author would neither have begun nor ended this Discourse so as the Reader finds it, if he had at first design'd it for publick view, or been willing to engage himself in this unhappy contest. He was moved to examine the learned part of the Reverend Dr.'s Volume, because he found it not at first view, agreeable to what upon some converse with the Ancients, he had long taken to be the sence and practice of the Church, especially in the first and best Ages. He was encouraged to pursue the enquiry, because the issue thereof, however it proved, could be no other than was very desirable. For he could not but count it an advantage, either to have his apprehensions rectified, if he were mistaken; or to be confirmed in his Judgment if it were right, and that by a person of such eminency, as he knows none of his standing, superiour to him for learning in the Church of England. So that what he aimed at, when he first undertook it, was his own private Satisfaction; but some papers being got out of his hands, he found himself brought

*

brought to these Terms, that either he must publish them himself, or have it done by others; and had only the liberty to chuse which of these he counted most tolerable.

Of what consideration the points here discussed are in reference to the main question under debate, may soon be discerned. If there were no Diocesan Churches, nor Bishops without the Choice or Consent of the People, in the Primitive times; then the imputation of Schism with respect thereto, is not over-reasonably fixed on Dissenters. For with what reason can they be branded as Schismatics for declining such Churches, and not submitting to such Bishops, as the Church in the best Ages of Christianity, either did not know, or would not own? In this case either we must be acquitted, or the Primitive and Universal Church will be involved in the same condemnation with us. And the charge of Schism is in danger to recoil here. It is counted on all hands, far more Schismatical to divide from the Universal Church, especially in its Primitive integrity; than from any particular Church in degenerate times: And doth it not look very like such a dividing from the prime Catholick Church, when this is relinquished in matters of so great concern; so that such Churches are formed as were unknown to the Christian World in the first and best times; and Bishops of those Churches are only owned, and set over them in such a way as was universally disclaimed both then, and in many Ages after?

ter? If adhering to these Churches (and to none else
 but in dependance on them) and resigning our selves up
 to those Bishops as our Pastors, be made so necessary;
 that those are counted none of the Church, or worthy
 to be cast out, who yield not thereto: We need not
 fear, in these circumstances, to let our accusers be
 Judges who are the Schismaticks, when they are un-
 der no Temptation to be partial. "A Church (saies Dr.
 "St.) may Seperate her self from the Communion of the
 "Catholick by taking upon her to make such things the
 "necessary conditions of her Communion, which never
 "were the Conditions of Communion with the Catholick
 "Church. — The Being of the Catholick Church
 "lies in Essentials: for a particular Church to disagree
 "from all other particular Churches in some extrinse-
 "cal and accidental things, is not to Separate from the
 "Catholick Church, so as to cease to be a Church;
 "but still, whatever Church makes such extrinsecal
 "things the necessary Conditions of Communion, so as
 "to cast men out of the Church who yield not to them,
 "is Schismatical in so doing; for it thereby divides
 "it self from the Catholick Church: And the Sepera-
 "tion from it is so far from being Schism, that be-
 "ing cast out of that Church on those Terms, only re-
 "turns them to the Communion of the Catholick
 "Church. On which grounds it will appear that yours
 "is the Schismatical Church, and not ours. — Not
 "only persons, but Churches may depart from the Ca-

Rational Ac-
count. part. 2.
chap. 4. Sect. 3.
p. 358, 359.

“tholick Church; and in such Cases not those who
“depart from the Communion of such Churches, but
“those Churches which departed from the Catholick
“are guilty of the Schism.

Upon whom this Sentence falls, and who are acquitted
hereby, may be easily discerned; if there be no evi-
dence that the Churches and Bishops in question,
now made so necessary, were known or owned in
the Primitive times. And I know not from whom
this Evidence can be expected, if not from so excellent
a person as Dr. St. when he has made it his business
to produce it. Whether he has done it or not, is left
to the Judgment of the impartial, upon the perusing
of what follows.

ERRATA.

P Age 7. line 9. r. 200000. p. 11. l. 12, 13. r. *Germanio*, p. 20. l. 30. dele *to*,
p. 21. l. 13. r. *where*, for *eighty* p. 38. l. 17, 24. p. 39. l. 9. p. 40. l. 1, 17.
r. 800.

No

*No Evidence for Diocesan Churches, or
any Bishops without the Choice or Con-
sent of the People, in the Primitive
Times.*



THE Testimonies of the *Ancients* which the Reverend and Learned Dr. makes use of, concern two heads, and are alledged either for *Diocesan Churches*, or against *popular Elections* of Bishops. Before I come to examine the former particularly, let it be observed in general, that those Reverend persons whom the Dr. opposes, make account that in the Primitive times a Regular Church was but a *particular* Congregation, and constituted of no more than might conveniently meet together for Church-communion. Yet they deny not but there might be in after-times some *Heteroclites*, Churches extraordinarily numerous, so as they could not ordinarily and with convenience hold personal Communion in one place; but they find no Instances hereof in the two first Ages of Christianity, nor Evidence for any Number in the *third*, nor in the best part of the *fourth* for very many, compared with the rest which transgressed not the Primitive and Regular bounds. And this they judge will be no great prejudice to their Hypothesis. He that shews three or four men (among many thousands) corpulent, overgrown

and

and of extraordinary Stature; doth not thereby prove that the rest are not commonly of a regular proportion, more like men than Giants. If those so numerous Churches could be thought on that account to have been *Diocesan*, yet could it not be from thence inferred that the ancient Churches were commonly *Diocesan*, unless we may draw a general Conclusion from that which is very rare and extraordinary. But indeed it cannot hence be proved that those few Churches, consisting of so very numerous Members, were like the *Diocesan*s now contended for. It is just here as it is with our *Parishes* in England, besides those of a common and ordinary size, there are some which are excessively numerous, containing very many thousand Souls, some thirty or forty, or sixty, or more thousands; yet it would be ridiculous to account each of these *Parishes* a *Diocese*; when all know the largest of them is but a small part of one. These *Parishes* at first contained no more than could meet for Worship in one place; Being in some Ages grown too populous to meet together, they should have been divided, so as to answer the ends of their first regular establishment; but continuing as they are, they pass still (as the lesser do) for single Congregations, and these with hundreds of others make up but one *Diocesan* Church. The ancient Churches are in these respects correspondent to these *Parishes*. So that if the Dr. had brought us some Instances of ancient Episcopal Churches as numerous as our great *Parishes*, containing many more than could well meet together, yet this would not have proved them *Diocesan* Churches, no, nor more than some single Congregations; but I think all that he produces amounts not to so much. This will appear by examining the severals alledged.

To prove that the Church of Carthage in Cyprian's time was more than a single Congregation (and no less than a Diocese, which is the thing to be proved) he shows out of his Epistles, that there were many Presbyters in that Church. But this will be no proof to those who consider, that it was the practice of old to multiply Presbyters and other Officers, beyond what we count necessary. Dr. Downham saies, at first the number of Christians in Cities were sometimes not much greater than the number of Presbyters among them. His words are these, *Indeed at the very first Conversions of Cities, the whole number of the people converted (being sometimes not much greater than the number of Presbyters placed among them,) were able to make but a small Congregation*^b. Such a number of Presbyters would be far from proving a Church in such Cities to be more than a single Congregation, much farther from proving it to be as large as a Diocese. This practice which the Bishop will have to be Primitive, of making so many Presbyters in one Church, was followed in after times. Nazianzen tells us, in the fourth Age, that sometimes the Officers in a Church did well nigh exceed the number of those whom they ruled, *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐν τοιαύταις ἡ πόλις ἀρχιερεῖς ἔσται*^c. How then can forty six or sixty Presbyters be an argument that the Church where they were was as large as a Diocese, or larger than the greatest Congregation? *Justinian* observing that Officers in Churches were multiplied beyond reason and measure, takes order that they should be reduced to the numbers at the first establishment, but in the great Church at Constantinople, he would have the Presbyters brought down to sixty. No doubt they were numerous in *Constantine's* time, who endeavoured to make that City in all things equal to Rome, *ἵσα μὲν τῇ Ῥώμῃ*.

^a Part. 3. Sect. 4. pag. 229.

^b Dissert. L. 2. Cap. 1. Pag. 6.

^c Orat. 1.

d Soc. L. 2.
Cap. 2.

Palmyra, and built two Churches in it, sayes the Historian d. Yet in the latter end of his Reign, after the death of Arius, the Christians there could all meet together for Worship. It is said expressly, that Alexander Bishop of that Church, *αὐτὸν οὐκ ἦν τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἱερ-*

e Theodoret. L. 1.
1. Cap. 14.

But there is one passage afterwards which may seem more considerable. Pag. 230. At Carthage we have this evidence of the great number of Christians, that in the time of Persecution, although very many stood firm, yet the number of the lapsed was so great, that St. Cyprian saith, every day thousands of Tickets were granted by the Martyrs and Confessours in their behalf for Reconciliation to the Church. And in one of those Tickets sometimes might be comprehended twenty or thirty Persons, the form being, *Communicet ille cum suis.*

f Sermo de Lapsis.

The Numbers of the Lapsed were great, it seems by Cyprian's expression f, they were the greatest part of his Church; for he sayes, *The greatest part of the Brethren denied the Faith, (Maximus Fratrum numerus Fidem suam prodidit,)* at the first approach of the Persecution, before they were apprehended, or so much as inquired after, besides those that fell when the danger was nearer, and the tryal more sharp. Elsewhere he tells us, that this wasting Persecution did al-

g Lib. 4. Ep. 4.
Initio.

most unpeople his Church g, and he mentions *numerofam Languentium Sinagagē, & exiguam stantium paucitatem*, signifying that those who fell were many, those that

h Ibid. ad finem.

stood but very few h. Very many hundreds are not necessary to make a company numerous, and very few added to those (or to some thousands) will not make the Church of Carthage so exceeding great as some seem to imagine it. However the lapsed were not near so many as is here insinuated. For by this reckon-

reckoning the *lapsed* Christians at *Carthage* will be more by many *Myriads* than all the Inhabitants of the City, Christians and Heathens together. For suppose these *thousands of Tickets* were but two or three thousand, and every day amounted but to ten dayes; and the numbers in each *Ticket*, reckoned *sometimes twenty, sometimes thirty*, were but one with another *ten*, the numbers of the *lapsed* will be 300000; whereas all the Inhabitants were not above 20000. as we may well suppose, since the Inhabitants of *Antioch*, a greater and more populous City (as Authors generally report it,) were no more, as *Chrysostom* who well knew it, gives the account, *πικρὸν μὲν εἶδος ἐστὶν*. Therefore the thousands here must pass, as is ordinary in all Authors, for *very many*. So *Eusebius* sayes there were *μυρία, thousands* of Bishops in a Synod of *Antioch* for the censure of *Paulus Samosatenus*.^k And another ancient Author speaks of thousands of Bishops at the Council of *Chalcedon**, whereas there was but about 600 at the latter, and not so many by far at the former. Thus *Theodoret* giving an account of his Preaching at *Antioch*, saith it was known, that *many Myriads* (*μυριάδες*) did meet in one place to hear; whereas two or three *Myriads* are more than can well hear any one preach. And then the Tickets comprehending *twenty or thirty* (which multiply the numbers of the *lapsed* excessively) must be left out of the reckoning, for there was none such granted by the Martyrs, as *Cyprian* declares in the *Epistle* cited. Though there were some drawn up in such a blind form (*Communicet ille cum suis*) as might include twenty or thirty, yet saies he, *Nunquam omnino à Martyribus factum est*¹, this was never done by the Martyrs. Thus the expression *Ep. 5.* will amount to no more than this; the Martyrs were daily solicited and importuned, to grant

ⁱ Orat. in Ignat.
Tom. 5. Act. 10.

^k Hist. Lib. 7.
Cap. 23.

* Vid. et Cecrop.
ap. Sebastop. in
Concil. Chalced.

¹ Epist. 83.

¹ Lib. 3. Ep. 13

grant great numbers of *Taken*. So it can't be hence concluded that the Christians at Carthage were more, or so many as are in some of our Parishes. It is manifest by many plain passages in *Cyprian*, that his whole Church (which in his style is, *Plebs universa*—*omnes stantes Laici*—*tota Fraternitas*;) did frequently meet together, both for Acts of Worship, and other Church affairs; which as they enforce the sense I have given of the expression alledged, on those who will have *Cyprian* consistent with himself; so may convince all, who weigh them impartially, that the Christians then at Carthage were nothing near so many as the Dr. supposes.

In the next head, pag. 230. that which he would prove, if we may judge by his Conclusion, pag. 231, 232, is, that the power of Discipline was not then supposed to be in the Congregation, or that they were the first subject of the power of the Keys, and that they thought it not then in the power of the People to appoint and ordain their own Officers. But this Dr. O. no were asserts, if I understand him, and so it might have been spared. However he proves it, let us see how. 'The Presbyters and the whole Church were under the particular care and government of St. *Cyprian*' as 'their Bishop, p. 230.

The Presbyters were then no wayes under the Government of the Bishop, but as those that are joint Rulers may be said to be under the government of one another. The whole Church was not under the Bishops government alone, but was ruled jointly by the Bishop and Elders. That the Presbyters and Bishop concurred in the government, is acknowledged by the best assertors of Episcopacy amongst us, Dr. *Field*, Bishop *Downham*, Bishop *Hall*, Mr. *Thorn-dike*, Primate *Usher*, &c. Dr. *S.* doth not deny it,

may,

nay, he elsewhere asserts and proves^m it by many an-^m *Iren. pag.*
 cient testimonies, *Cyprians* particularly. 'Thus *Cor-* ^{335, 336. 354.}
melius at *Rome*—Thus *Cyprian* at *Carthage*, one ^{355.}
 'who pleads as much as any for obedience to Bishops ;
 'and yet none more evident for the presence and
 'joint concurrence and assistance of the Clergy at all
 'Church debates, &c. And to prevent the usual eva-
 sion, he adds, 'That they concurred in governing
 'the Church, and not only by their *Counsel*, but *Autho-*
 'rity, appears from the general sense of the Church,
 'even when Episcopacy was at the highest.

There is nothing in the passages here produced
 out of *Cyprian*, that can be in the least serviceable ^{P. 230, 231.}
 to prove the *sole jurisdiction* of a Bishop. The im- ^{233.}
 port of them is no more, but that in matters of Dis-
 cipline, the People and Elders should do nothing
 without him ; even as he declared that he would
 do nothing without them. How this sets the Church
 of *Carthage* at any distance from *Dr. O's Hypothe-*
 sis, I understand not.

Nor can I apprehend how the third head crosses the ^{Pag. 232.}
Dr. more than others, or more than himself. That
 the *Pastoral authority* for governing a Church is of
divine institution, is not denied, but that the *superio-*
rity or preeminence of a Bishop above Presbyters is
 of such institution, *Cyprian* says not, nor is it the
 sense of any of the *Ancients*, as *Dr. St.* hath declar-
 ed heretofore (and retracts not here) proving it by
 the testimonies of *Jerom*, *Hilary*, *Augustine*, *Isidore*,
 and a Council at *Sevil*ⁿ ; shewing also how expressi-ⁿ *Iren. pag.*
 ons in the *ancient Writers*, which seem to be of ano- ^{312, 313.}
 ther tendency, are to be understood^o.

'Pag. 233. Let the Reader now judge whether ^o *Pag. 314,*
 'these be the strokes and lineaments of the Congre- ^{315.}
 'gational way.

If the Dr. had thought fit to take notice of the *strokes and lineaments* of the Congregational way, supposed to be apparent in *St. Cyprians* Writings, he should have produced something out of him against these severals. 1. That a Church then was but a single Congregation, consisting of no more than could meet together for Personal Communion. 2. That this Church was not under the government of any other Bishops or Rulers besides their own Bishop and Officers. 3. That the concerns of this Congregation were not ordered without the common consent of the People belonging to it. If it be plain in *Cyprian* that this was the State of the Church at *Carthage*, it will be the more considerable because the Dr. tells us, that *Cyprian speaks of nothing peculiar to his own Church, but what was generally observed over the Christian World.*

I meet with no more out of Antiquity to this purpose, till we come to *pag. 245.* there he offers two *Observables*, and fortifies them with ancient Testimonies.

Obs. 1. That it was an inviolable Rule amongst them, that there was to be but one Bishop in a City, though the City were never so large, or the Christians never so many.

This was no *inviolable Rule*. No Rule at all in *Scripture*, none such observed or known in *Scripture-times*. Those that are for *Episcopacy* in its greatest elevation, maintain, that there were more Bishops than one in a City, particularly *Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, Ephesus, &c.* in and after the Apostles times. Others that proceed upon other grounds, find in *one City* more of those who in *Scripture Style* are *Bishops*, though not in the *Style* of after-times. *Phil. 1. Acts 20. 17, &c.* Dr. S. himself must either hold that there

there were no Bishops in Scripture-times, or more of them than one in a City: for he acknowledges that in the Apostles times in one Church there were more Presbyters than one; and yet ascribes the superiority which makes the difference between a Bishop and Presbyters, not to divine or Apostolical appointment, or any act of the Apostles; but to *humane Institution, and an act of the Church.*

This Rule might well be observed in Cities where there were no more Christians than there are in a single Congregation; and this is supposed to be the case of *Carthage*, and other Churches in *Cyprians* time and after, nor has Dr. Sr. brought any thing sufficient to disprove it; and therefore *Cyprians* Testimonies for one Bishop might have been spared. Nor is there any ground to conclude that the *1 Thess. 5. 12, 13. Heb. 13. 17.* were not so understood by the *African* Churches, as they are by *M. B.* And *Cyprian* who is so positive for one Bishop, is as peremptory but for one Flock. *Esse posse uno in loco aliquis existimat aut multos Pastores, aut plures greges?* Can any one imagine that in one place, there should be either more Pastors, or more Flocks? viz. More than one. But the *Dioceans* now pleaded for, may have many hundred Flocks, and but one Pastor.

When there were more Christians in a City than one Bishop could perform the Duties of a Pastor to, this Rule might afterwards be observed, though not inviolably and without exception; no, nor where Christians were less numerous. At *Jerusalem* when *Narcissus* had the Chair, not to mention those who were Bishops there in his retirement, (*Dius* and *Germanicon*;) *Gordius* was in the Seat when he returned, and resumed the Bishoprick, and *Alexander* was afterwards made Bishop with him &c. At *Cæsarea*, *Theo-*

p De unitate
Ecclesie.

q Euseb. Lib. 6.
Cap. 10, 11.

r *Idem* *ibid.*
Lib. 7. *Cap.* 32.

s *Soz.* *Lib.* 2.
Cap. 19.

* *De Imp.*
Summ. potest.
C. 11. *S.* 11.

Her. 68. m. 8.

Socrat. 1. 7. c. 7.

r *Vit.* *Aug.*
cap. 8.

u *Ep.* 110.

† *Can.* 8.

x *Cablon.* 1.
Can. 4.

tesnus and *Anatolius* were for some time Bishops together^r. Afterwards *Macarius* and *Maximus* were at once Bishops in that Church^s. *Epiphanius* (alleged by *Grotius** for this purpose) signifies that other Cities had two Bishops, and excepts but one. *Alexandria* had never two Bishops, *ὡς αἱ ἄλλαι πόλεις*, as other Cities had. His meaning cannot be (as a great Antiquary would have it) that *Alexandria* was never so divided, as that several parties in it should have their respective Bishops there. For so it was divided in the time of *Epiphanius*, when the Catholicks had *Athanasius*, the *Arians* had *Gregorius*, and then *Georgius*; and afterwards the one had *Peter*, the other *Lucius*. And the *Novatians* had their Bishops successively in that City, till *Cyrils* time. But to wave other Instances, let me only add one, yet such a one as is pregnant, comprising very many at once, and shews this was customary in the Churches every where through the world. *Valerius* made *Augustine* Bishop with him at *Hippo*, with the concurrence of the Bishops in those parts, who assured *Augustine* that *this was usual*, and proved it by Examples both in the *Affrican* and *transmarine* Churches, as *Possidonium* tells us^t. And *Augustine* alleges nothing to hinder him from making *Eradius* Bishop with him, when he designed him to be his Successour, but only the prohibition of the *Nicene Council* u. That is the first Rule we meet with against it[†], and there it is not directly prohibited, but only by Insinuation. Afterwards the Bishops were more positive in forbidding it, having in time discovered a very cogent reason for it, assigned by a Synod in the middle of the seventh Age^x, *Nē res Ecclesie seve divisione debeant partiri*, Lest the Churches Revenues should be divided, and so one Bishop should not have all, which seemed a cruel thing to those Fathers.

But

But to return to former Ages; where the custom continued of having but one Bishop in a City when the multitude of Christians in it required more, the practice of their Predecessors was pleaded for it; when the case was quite altered, and the *reason* which had lead them to it in better times, was not extant. As if in the behalf of some Parishes amongst us, grown in time extraordinarily populous, so as some thousands of the Inhabitants cannot meet at once in the Parish Church, it should be alledged, that they ought not to be divided into distinct Rectories, because each of them was but one Parish under one Rector at first, and for some Ages since: when the *reason* why it was but *one* at first, and after, was because it contained not too many for *one*. If any offer to derive it from a higher Original, and pretend it was from *Apostolical* Tradition, Dr. St. tells us, they did it upon a mistake, *judging of the practice of the Apostles by that of their own times*.

y *Iren.* p. 317.

Yet in Cities so well replenished with Christians, where the Bishop had Assistants joined with him, each of which had, and exercised the intire power of Pastors, an honorary presidency only reserved to the Bishop, *M. B.* will not say the instituted *species* of Government is there alter'd: nor that this is like such a *Dio-cesan* Church where there are many *myriads* of Christians, more than all the Inhabitants of *Carthage* amounted to, all under one Bishop as their *sole Pastor*.

Pag. 246. One of the greatest and most pernicious *Schisms* that ever happened, might have been prevented, if they had yielded to more Bishops than one in a City, and that was the Schism of the *Donatists* upon the competition between *Majorinus* and *Cacilian*.

I can-

I cannot conceive how yielding to more Bishops than one in a City might have prevented the Schism of the *Donatists*, unless the ancient Church had quite another *Idea* of Schism than D. St. has ; for he counts those Assemblies Schismatical, which differ less both in Opinion and Practice from those he allows, than the *Donatists* did from the *Catholicks*. The *Donatists* held that Ordinations by *Traditors* were null and void, that *Cacilian* and many others, had no better Ordination ; and consequently those Churches must with them be no true Churches, their Officers were to be reordain'd, and the People rebaptized ; and this was their practice. Now I don't see any reason to think, that *Cacilians* allowing the *Donatists* a Bishop in *Carthage* would have made them quit their Principles ; for they presumed they might have a Bishop of their own there, whether *Cacilian* and his Party allow'd it or no ; and notwithstanding any disallowance had so actually, one Bishop succeeding another, for an hundred years together.

Pag. 246. Let M. B. reconcile these words to his Hypothesis if he can.

If the Church *Cyprian* speaks of contained no more than some single Congregation, which let D. St. disprove, M. B. will not find any difficulty in reconciling what *Cyprian* says against *Novatian* (for being chosen a Bishop in that City, where there was one before) to his own Hypothesis : for it amounts to no more than this, that there should be no more than one Pastor in the same Congregation ; and till the former be disproved, those testimonies pag. 247, 248. are to no purpose.

I see not how it can be justly inferred from what is alledged out of St. *Augustin*, concerning the proposal of *Melchiades*, p. 248. that *the best, the wisest, the most*

most moderate persons never once thought that there could be more Bishops than one in a City. What Melchisedes proposes, doth not signifie that he thought there was a necessity for but one Bishop, as if there could be no more; though he might think it not expedient where one was sufficient, and more were not like to agree together. St. Augustin himself who applauds the proposal, thought there might be more. He was actually Bishop of Hippo (as was shew'd before) together with Valerius. And he concurr'd afterwards, with the rest of the Affrican Bishops in allowing it elsewhere.

I find no such rule on both sides in the conference at Carthage as he next tells us of. But one Bishop to be allowed of either side of a City or Diocess. It's true both sides seem'd unwilling to own that they erected new Bishopricks, on purpose to make one party appear more numerous than the other: but none of them were disallowed upon this account, either as Bishops or actors in that Conference. All the Catholick Bishops there, and St. Augustin with them, in their Epistle to Marcellinus, there recited, offer the Donatists, that being reconciled, *nec honorem Episcopatus amittant*, they should continue Bishops. And afterwards in their greatest Councils they allow, that there might be two Bishops in one place on several occasions; particularly, if the Donatists Bishop was converted, then the place was to be divided between him and the other Bishop. This the Dr. takes notice of p. 251. and we shall do it further, when he leads us to it.

Sect. 9. Obs. 2. Pag. 249. 'In Cities and Diocesses which were under the care of one Bishop, there were several Congregations and Altars and distant places. Carthage was a very large City, &c. And there.

'there, besides the *Cathedral*, were several other considerable Churches, &c.

This was in the *fifth* Age. *Victor* ends his History in the latter end of it, about the Year 480. Now it is the *three first* Ages principally, wherein it is said, there were not more Christians than in some single Congregation, nor more fixed Churches than one in a City. In the *fourth* there might be more in some Cities, but those Cities were very few. *Petavius* could but name *two* in the latter end of that Age. In the *fifth* Age there might be more, but then the Church was greatly declining, as appears by the complaints of *Austin*, *Chrysostom*, *Isidore*, *Pelusiota*, *Prosper*, *Salvian*, &c. The ambition and other extravagancies of the Bishops promoted it. *Chrysostome* in the violent prosecution which ended in his ejection and banishment, says he feared none so much as the

z Ep. 13. p. 8.
95.

a Socrat. Hist.
Lib. 7. Cap. 7.
11.

Bishops. ἡ δὲ τὰς λοιπὴν ἑκδοὺς αἰς ἐπισκοπίας. And the Bishops of those two Cities, *Rome* and *Alexandria*, which first transgressed the primitive bounds of Churches, are noted as the first that turn'd the government, of the Church into *domination*, and did it in that Age. But yet there is reason to believe that the case was not much alter'd at *Carthage* in this Age, for though there were very many brought over to Christianity, yet great numbers of them were with the *Donatists*. In *Carthage* it self, they had their Bishops in succession, *Majorinus*, *Donatus*, *Parmenianus*, *Primianus*, who was confirm'd in the Chair at *Carthage* by a Synod of 310 Bishops; *Maximianus* being declared Bishop there at the sametime, by two other Synods; the one consisting of above fifty the other of above an hundred Bishops. So that it seems that *Self* had two Bishops at once in *Carthage*, in the latter end of the *fourth* Age; and vying with the *Catholicks*

b August. Lib.
3. C. 4. contra
Chescon.

licks

licks for numbers, they might have as many Churches as they. *Rebaptizante Donati parte majorem multitudinem Afrorum*, the Donatists rebaptized the major part of the *Africans*, saith *Possidonius*. However the number of their Churches will not prove the thing in Question. Out of the Sermons *De Tempore*, and *De Diversis*, which go under St. *Austins* name, but are of uncertain Authors, and so are of little account, he reckons eight Churches; but there were more in *Alexandria* when the Christians did all meet there in one place. And since, after the disturbance by *Arius*, the Presbyters were not suffer'd to preach in *Alexandria*; either the people must meet in one place to hear the Bishop preach, or be without preaching. *M. B.* proved that they did meet in one place, and I think his proof is still satisfying notwithstanding what is answered. Nor doth it appear that all those Churches were for Communion; they might communicate with the Bishop in the greater *Basilica*, and the rest might serve for other Offices, as *Damasus* (or whoever was the Writer of the Popes lives) saies, the 25. or 15. *Tituli* were erected at *Rome* by *Marcellus*, *propter Baptismum et penitentiam multorum et Sepulturas*. Hence *D. Taylor* infers, that at *Rome* there was then (*viz.* in the beginning of the fourth Age) no preaching but in the Mother Church: (And then not only at *Alexandria*, but at *Rome* in the fourth Age, if the people met not in one place with the Bishop, they could have no Sermon;) and the inference is altogether as just, that there there was no *Eucharist* but at the great Church. So that those places, (call them what you will, *Tituli*, or *Λαύρα*, or *Basilica*,) seem to be but *Oratories*, and not intended or used for celebrating the Lords Supper. And there are more of these in some one of our

*c Vita Aug.
Cap. 6.*

*d Socrat. Hist.
Lib. 5. Cap. 21.*

*Episc. Affr. p.
297.*

Parishes than either at *Alexandria* or *Carthage*, and yet the people not so numerous, but they can and do communicate together.

Page 250. to shew that there were more Altars than one where Christians did communicate in a City (or Bishoprick, contrary to what he had asserted in his Sermon) he alledges a passage in the *Conferentie at Carthage*, where *Fortunatus* objects to *Petilian*, That in the Town where he was Bishop, the Hereticks had broken down all the Altars. But this will be no good argument, that there were more Altars for the Eucharist than one in a Town, to those who take notice that in *Africa* there were abundance of Altars for other designs and purposes, than celebrating the Eucharist. Particularly, there were many erected as *Memorie Martyrum*, which appears by the fifth Council at *Carthage*, Can. 14. where those Fathers take notice of such Altars in the Fields, the Ways, & *ubique*, and every where; and some of them they condemn, (*viz.* those, *In quibus nullum corpus aut reliquia Martyrum condita probantur*,) others they approve.

He shews, that places distant from the City were in the Bishops Diocese, but these will not serve his turn, nor will what is alledged serve for proof. It is a Canon in the *African Code*, that no Bishop should leave his Cathedral Church, and go to any other Church in his Diocese there to reside.

a Can. 71.

But suppose this Cathedral Church was in some Village, it cannot hence be proved that any places distant from a City, were in the Bishop's Diocese, *viz.* in the Diocese of the City Bishop. And this is no improbable supposition; indeed there's near ten to one for it, since in *Africa* for one Bishop in a City there might be ten in Villages. And none will doubt of this, who know how many hundred Bishops there were

were in *Africa*, and how few Cities. Their *Cathedral Churches*, (though the sound be big to those who measure them by ours) were all, but a few in comparison, *Village-Cathedrals*; it may be some of our *Chappels of Ease* out-do them.

But it evidently proves that there were more Churches in a *Bishops Diocese*. And so are there many *Chappels* and some Churches too in some one of our Country *Parishes*. But this will be far from evidently proving any such thing, if the *Canon* be rightly represented; for there it is not *this Diocese*, either in the *Greek* or *Latin* Copies, but a *Diocese*, and so may either be a Church belonging to another *Bishop*, or a *Diocese* that had no *Bishop*: for *Diocesses* there were in that Country which never had *Bishops*, as appears by the *second Council of Carthage*, where it is decreed that *Dioceses which never had a Bishop, should not have any*.

The word *Diocese*, as it is most frequently used in ancient Writers, denotes that which is either so much bigger, or so far less than a modern *Diocese*, that he who argues from one to the other, may run into mistakes himself, and lead others with him. In the former acception, it contains many *Provinces*; so *Balsomon* defines it, *si totius imperii forma*. The whole *Roman Empire* was divided into twelve or thirteen such *Dioceses*, and *Africa* under the *Romans* was but one of them, *Justinian* reducing all the *African Provinces* into one *Diocese*. In the latter acception it is used for a Country Town or Village, for a *Parish* or part of a *Parish*. Thus a *Presbyter* is said *Diocesis tenere*, to hold a *Diocese*, and *Pappolus* is said *Diocesis* *Ecclisiam circumire*, where *Dioceses* and *Villages* seem to explain one another, as *Dioceses* and *Parishes* do in another Council. So

f *Can. 5. Code*
f *Affric. Can. 53.*

g *In Calced.*
Concil. *Can. 17.*

h *Novel 131.*

i *Con. Agath.*
Can. 53, 54.

k *Greg. Tiron.*
lib. 5. *Hist.*
Franc. cap. 5.

l *Tolet. 4.*
Can. 36.

m^{Or}. 4. Can.
32.

a *Diocese* is put for a Church or a Chappel, which a man erects in his own ground; thus a Synod at Orleans orders^m, that *when any man hath, or desires to have a Diocese in his ground, he must allow competent Land thereto, and provide a Clerk for it.* Like these were the Dioceses mentioned in the *African* Canons, and their Bishopricks were answerable.

n^{Cor} Carth. 2.
Can. 5. Code
Affric. 53.

It is determined in several *African* Canons, that the *Dioceses* which *never had Bishops, should have none.* But this was decreed upon terms and with exception, if the Christians in those places were multiplied, and they desired a Bishop of their own, they were to have one with the consent of those in whose power the places wereⁿ.

o Code Affric.
Can. 55.

Now when the people were numerous enough for this purpose, we may understand by the practice of those Churches, there were divers Bishops in *Africa* who had but one *Presbyter* belonging to them, as appears by the case which *Posthumianus* puts^o, of a Bishop having but one *Presbyter*. Hence Bishop *Bil-son* concludes, that Bishops oftentimes had but one *Presbyter* P.

p Perpet. Go-
vern. pag. 256.
Cap. 13.

So that the people were numerous enough to have a Bishop, where they were too many for the cure and inspection of one *Presbyter*. And this was the sence not only of the *African* Churches, but of the *Eastern* and *Western* also, as appears by the Council of *Sardica*, where the Bishops both from West and East assembled. There those Fathers, more careful than their Predecessors, thought needful, lest Bishops should be disparaged by having their Chairs in small places, to decree^q, that Bishops shall not be made in little Towns or Villages, and there explain which they count little; *Cui satis est unus Presbyter, such as one Presbyter is sufficient for.* But they add, where the People are numerous, (*viz.* So as one *Presbyter* will not suffice, as the contexture shews,) desiring a Bi-

q Can. 6.

shop,

shop, let them have one. So that it was the sence of the ancient Church, both in *Africa, Europe* and *Asia*, that in any place where there were so many Christians, as that a *Presbyter* needed an *Assistant*, there a *Bishop* ought to be placed. By this we may discern whether or no their *Bishopricks* were like our *Parishes*, especially considering that they thought it requisite to multiply *Presbyters* far more than we do now; and judged too, that one of them was not sufficient for so numerous a Flock as one hath now in charge. Their great number of *Presbyters* in many places shews this. To go no farther than *Carthage*, where the *Dr.* finds but eight Churches great and small, yet the Clergy were above five hundred; so many belonging to *Carthage* were banished by *Hunericus*, as *Victor* tells us^r. *Jerome* saith, the *Pres-*

^r *De Persecut. Vandal. Lib. 1.*

^s *Epist. ad Evag.*

byters were multiplied so excessively, that they became contemptible; *Presbyteros turba contemptibiles facit*^s.
 'And where the *Donatists* had erected new *Bishopricks*, the *African* Council decrees that after the decease of such *Bishop*, if the people had no mind to have another in his room, they might be in the *Diocese* of another *Bishop*: which shews that they thought the *Dioceses* might be so large as to hold the people that were under two *Bishops*,
 p. 250.

It was most common in *Africa* to have *Bishops* in Villages, and ordinary for the *Donatists* to have a *Bishop* in the same place where the *Catholicks* had one; which shews, that they thought, that the *Diocese* need be no larger, than that a Village might hold the People that were under two *Bishops*. The *Catholicks* decree, that when a *Donatist* *Bishop* was deceased, if the reduced people would have another in his place, they were to have one without consulting a Council.

^r *Code Africa.*

Can. 99.

'There

There were many Canons made about the People of the *Donatist* Bishops. In one it was determined, that they should belong to the Bishop that converted them, &c. After that, that they should belong to the same Diocese they were in before.

But if the converted People desired to have a Bishop of their own, as they had before, then they were to belong to neither, as appears by several *Canons*. So that in this case, *African* Bishops might be as numerous, and consequently as small, after the *Donatists* were reduced, as before; and so far enough from any resemblance of modern *Diocesans*, and as like our *Parishes* as *Mr. B.* would have them.

But if the *Donatist* Bishop were converted, the Diocese was to be divided between them, pag. 251.

Thus in a City, when there was both a *Catholic* and a *Donatist* Bishop (than which nothing was more ordinary) if the *Donatist* was converted, the Town must be divided between them; and two Bishops were to be continued in one City. In some places there were four Bishops of one Party, for one of the other. *Verissimus* Bishop at *Tacara* saith, in his flock there were four other Bishops, *Datianus*, *Aspidius*, *Fortunatus* and *Octavianus* *. Suppose where there were four *Donatist* Bishops, they had all been converted, the place by this Rule must have been divided amongst five Bishops. And so in a Village where there were two Bishops, as there was at *Murugena*, (and many other such places in *Africa* *,) the *Donatist* Bishop being converted, the Village was to be divided between them into two Dioceses, and each Diocese there had been no more than half a Parish with us. *Mr. B.* will not be much against such *Diocesans*, nor troubled at any such proofs out of antiquity for *Diocesans* of another kind.

u Can. 99.
Can. 118.

* Collat. Carth.
D. 1. N. 121.

x Ibid. N. 133.
& N. 207.

He passes to *Hippo*, and in the Countrey about it finds divers Presbyters and Deacons, whereby he would prove the largeness of that Diocese. But he might there have found divers Bishops also. That there were more Bishops in the Countrey which he would appropriate to St. *Austins* jurisdiction, may appear by those very instances which the Dr. makes use of to shew, that he was the only Bishop there, and the Presbyters and Deacons in those places, all under his care and government.

Fussala is one of them, and this is acknowledged to have had a Bishop, though it was but a *Castle*, and so called more than once in the place cited. The reason why it had a Bishop no sooner, is signified by *Austin*, when he saith, there were no Catholicks at all in it; *In eodem Castello nullus esset omnino Catholicus*; but multitudes of *Donatists*. Yet when some were gained to the Church there, or in the parts about it, a Bishoprick was erected in it for the Catholicks. The place being remote from *Hippo*, *Austin* was sensible that the charge was too great for him, extending further than it ought, and discerning that he was not sufficient for the diligence which in all reason was due to it, he took care that a Bishop should be ordained, and placed there: *Me viderem latius quam oportebat extendi, nec adhibenda sufficere diligentia, quam certissima ratione adhiberi debere cernebam*.

But the Dr. sayes, he was fain to resume it. What he understands thereby, I don't well know, but if any thing be meant for his purpose, it must be that this Bishoprick was extinguished. But there's no ground for this. It's true *Antonius*, made Bishop there, was upon some complaints put out of *Fussala*, yet *salvo Episcopatu*, so as he retained the Episcopal dignity; but the place was not deprived of the Episcopal Chair,

Chair, for though it might continue void for some-time, yet a Bishop is found there afterwards in the *African Notitia*, *Melior Fussalensis* is reckoned amongst the Bishops of *Numidia*. Hereby it is manifest that this holy Bishop could not digest so great a Diocese as the *Dr.* assigns him. He had the wisdom and humility to think himself not *sufficient* for a Charge so remote and extended; and he had the conscience not to charge himself with that which he was not *sufficient* for. So when *Fussala* had a competent Number of persons in it of their communion, he takes care (which was the general practice of the *African* Bishops) to form a Bishoprick in that *Castle*, and such a Diocese, as so small a place and some other near it could make. And this about *Anno*, 420. when the generality of the people tainted with *Dona-tism* was reduced, and Laws made for the banishment of their Bishops and Clergy, and the delivery of their Churches to the Catholics; and so, when it cannot be pretended that this Schism was the occasion of a further multiplication of Bishops.

‘It appears that a place forty Miles distant, was then under the care of so great a Saint, and so excellent a Bishop, as *Austin* was.

It was under his care, not as one that intended to be their Pastor, or as a fixed part of his Bishoprick, as places are which belong to one of our Dioceses; but only to make them capable of having a Pastor, and to have one placed amongst them, as the event makes it evident. Hereby it appears that the *Dr.* might have forborn his *Quarries*. We need not *guess* what answer *St. Austin* would have returned to them, he has done it actually in this Epistle, though it may be not to the *Dr.*’s Satisfaction. For the numbers at *Fussala*, he says, at first there was

not

not one Catholick, afterward there were but few, when there was more they had a Bishop of their own. And for taking upon him the care of so distant a place, he saies he was not sufficient for it himself, the care he took was to have it committed to another. So that Mr. B. sees no reason to tell *Austin*, that he understood not the right constitution of Churches; but he may see reason to tell others so, and thank St. *Austin* for here discovering it. I might have alledged, that this Epistle which the Dr. makes such use of, is suspected by learned men, as is noted in the last Edition of *Austin's* Epistles at *Paris*. It is not found in the ancient and less suspected Editions. The *Papists* (from whom we have it) are concerned for the credit of it. It helps them to an argument for the Bishop of *Rome's* power about Appeals from foreign parts. For *Antonius* Bishop of *Fussala*, being censured in *Africa*, appealed (it's said,) to *Celestinus* Bishop of *Rome*, to whom this Epistle is directed. But then it seems not likely that *Antonius* should have the confidence to do this, when the *African* Fathers had so positively declared against such Appeals; and *Apianus* a little before had found the like attempt so unsuccessfull. Nor is it probable, that St. *Austin* fortified with the Decrees of the *African* Councils, would be so much concerned (as this Epistle would make him) to hinder *Celestinus* from revoking the Sentence, which all the Authority of *Africa* had made irrevocable by any Bishop of *Rome*. But there's no need to insist on this, whether it be supposititious or not, we have offer'd enough to render it unserviceable to the Dr's design.

Another place he mentions for the said purpose, is *Municipium Tullense*, or *Tullense*, as some Editions have it. I meet with *Episcopatus Tullitensis* in a Catalogue

catalogue of *African* Bishops. It may be that denotes this very place; the variation of one letter need not hinder, since it is so common with the *African* writers to vary so much and more, in the naming of their Towns. Instances hereof might be given in abundance, take but this one. *Donatianus* a Bishop in the Province of *Byzacena*, is styled from his Bishoprick *Telepiensis* in one Council, *Teleptensis* elsewhere²; with the change of the same letter that is in the instance before us. Whether it be so or not, there's no doubt but if this Town was stored with Christians, it had a Bishop of its own, for it is scarce credible that when so many contemptible Villages in that Countrey had their Bishops, there should be none in so considerable a Corporation as this, which as appears by *Austin's* description of *Murca* the sick person, had its *Duum-virate*, and *Common-Council*, answerable to the *Consuls* and *Senate* at *Rome*, and was honoured with the Priviledges and immunities of the Imperial City.

However *Austin* doth not say that this Town had *Presbyter* and *Clerks* under his care and government. This is added without any ground that I can discern in the place cited, and without this addition the particular story which the Dr. recites does him not the least service.

Nor does St. *Austin* say to *Cecilian* the President, that he was Bishop of that *Diocese* (which the Dr. represents as a Region of large extent,) but only that he had *Episcopalem Sartinam Hipponensem*, the *Episcopal charge of Hippo*^a.

The third Town which he speaks of as in *Austin's* *Diocese*, is *Mutagema*, or *Mutigena*. But this also had its own Bishop, or two for a need. In the conference at *Carthage* there is *Antonius Episcopus Mutagenensis* for

^y *Milevit Can.*

^{17.}

^z *Collat. Carth.*

^{1.}

^a *Ep. 60*

for the Catholics, and *Splendinius* Bishop there for the *Donatists*^b. And thus it was even in *Hippo* it self, *Austin* was Bishop there for the Catholics, and *Macrobius* for the *Donatists*, who succeeded *Proculeianus* in the Chair there^c. So that *Austin* is so far from having all the Region under his Jurisdiction (this being parted amongst several other Bishops) that he had not the whole Town, the *Donatists* had a Diocese there, such a one as those in *Africa* used to be, where one little Town (and *Hippo* was none of the greatest) would serve for two Dioceses. And in some places where the *Donatists* had one Bishop, the Catholics would have four: And they were served in the same kind by the *Donatists*, who in other places had three or four for their one, of which there are several instances in that famous conference at Carthage^d.

^b D. I. N. 133.
& N. 207.

^c Ibid. N. 138.
N. 201. Ep. 88.
N. 8.

^d N. 107. 127.
65. 198.

Other Towns might be added which had Bishops of their own in that Region, but there's no need of more. St. *Austin* himself signifies plainly that there were more Bishops in the Territory of *Hippo*, when he moved *Jannarius* the Primate of the *Donatists*, that they would meet together with the Catholick Bishops, that were in that Territory, and who there suffered so much by the *Donatists*^e. *Ecce interim Episcopos nostros qui sunt in Regione Hippoensi ubi à vestris tanta mala patimur convenite.*

^e Ep. 68.

If the Region of *Hippo* was so very large as the Dr. represents it, there is no doubt but there were many good Villages in it. And Mr. *Thornäike* (whom none can suspect to be partial this way, his Bias rather leading him the other) tells us, That in *Africa*, Bishops were so plentiful, that every good Village must needs be the Seat of an Episcopal Church^f. And if, as the Dr. says, the notorious Schism of the *Donatists* was the occasion of the multiplication of Bishops in *Africa*,

^f Right
Churches re-
view, pag. 53.

they must be most multiplied in *Numidia*, to which *Hippo* belonged; because the *Donatists* were there most numerous. He that finds betwixt an hundred and two hundred Bishops in the Province of *Numidia*, and makes the Region of *Hippo* of more than forty miles extent, yet offers to prove there was but one Bishop in that Region; need not despair but he may make any thing probable.

After such plain Evidence of the extent of *Dioceses*, he would bring as clear proof of *Metropolitan Provinces* in the *African Churches*. To me they are both clear alike, who can discern nothing of Evidence in them. His proof is merely *Cyprians* calling that part of *Africa* where he lived, *Provincia nostra*, two or three times. Before *Ecclesiastical Metropolitans* were known in the World, *Africa* was by the *Romans* divided into *Provinces*, as our Kingdom hath been long into *Counties*. Cannot one that lives in an *English Shire*, call it *our County*, but that must be a clear proof that he is the Governour of it? *Cyprian* himself never dreamt of any such thing. He disclaims all Authority over the Bishops of that or any other *Province*, *Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum*

x In Conc. Carth. constituit x. The great *Causabon*, where he was concern'd to speak as favourably of the *English Constitution* as possibly could be, says, *It is most manifest that this Superiority was of humane Constitution, and in the first and second Ages; and a great part of the third, not known in the Church y.* And D. St. elsewhere tells us, *there was no difference as to the power of the Bishops themselves, who had all equal Authority in their several Churches, and none over another.* He not only says this, but brings for it clear proof indeed z, and finds no higher rule of *Metropolitanical Power* or *Priviledge*, than the Council at *Antioch*, near an hundred years after. The great

Privi-

y Exercit. 16.
Pag. 533.

z Item. pag. 372

Priviledge of *Metropolitans* (after they were established by Canon) wherein all their Authority consisted, while the State of the Church was tolerable; was their *presiding* in *Provincial Synods*, and there they had but a single Vote, about Ordinations, Censures or other affairs. In *Cyprians* Age, the Bishop in the prime City did often *preside* in Synods; but this honour they had not from obligation but *courtesie*, nor had they it alwaies, but others were chosen *Presidents*, sometimes out of some other respect to the place, than because it was a *Metropolis*, or the Bishop of it a *Metropolitan*. So in a Synod in *Palestine*, *Alexander* Bishop of *Jerusalem* was joint *President* with *Theophilus* of *Cæsarea*, though *Cæsarea*, not *Jerusalem*, was the *Metropolis* of *Palestine*^a. Sometimes for the worth of the Person, so *Osias* of *Corduba* was chosen *President* of divers Synods, in places remote from his Diocese and Countrey, *πῶς γὰρ ἐν ὁρίωνι οὐδαίς*, saies *Theodoret* of him^b. Sometimes for their Age, as *Palmas* Bishop of *Amastris* was *President* in a Synod in *Pontus* upon this account expressly, *ὡς ἀρχαιώτατος*, because the most *antient*^c. And in *Africa* long after, not he who had his Seat in the chief City of the Province, but he that was *antientest* among the Bishops had the *Primacy* in *Provincial Synods*^d, and this settled by Canon^e. By which it appears that the preeminence of *Metropolitans* was not established, either by Rule or invariable Custom, for the first three Ages. And afterwards, when in the *fourth* Age it was settled by Canon, yet then it was not much any where; but less it seems in *Africa* than in some other parts; since there they were so jealous of the ambition lurking (and now and then appearing) in the thing, that the Bishops there would not admit the Names, but

^a *Euseb. l. 5. c. 20. Tacit. Hist. l. 2. c. 23.*

^b *Hist. Lib. 2. Cap. 15.*

^c *Euseb. l. 5. c. 22.*

^d *Aug. Ep. 221.*

^e *Milevit. Can. 13. Code Afric. Can. 86.*

but declare, that the Bishop of the first Seat should not be called the Exarch of the Priests, or chief Priest, or any thing of like nature; but only the Bishop of the first Seat. Hence Dr. St. concludes, Therefore it hath been well observed, that the African Churches did retain longest the Primitive simplicity and humility among them, and when the Voice was said to be heard in the Church upon the flowing in of Riches, *Hodie venenum effusum est in Ecclesiam*, by the working of which Poyson the Spirits of the Prelates began to swell with Pride and Ambition, as is evident in Church History; only Africa escaped the infection most, &c. So that however Africa hath been always fruitful of Monsters, yet in that Ambitious Age, it had no other wonder but only this, that it should escape so free from that Typhus Secularis, (as they then call'd it,) that Monstrous Itch of Pride and Ambition.

f. Trm. p. 373.

Victor mentions one Crescens, who had One hundred and Twenty Bishops under him as Metropolitan, p. 253.

Under him; how? as one over whom he had jurisdiction, or to whom they swore Canonical Obedience? No such thing; but under him as an honorary President in their Assemblies; who there could do nothing without them as to any matters of moment, but was still to be concluded by their Votes, he having neither negative nor casting voice. Such a Moderator he was as the reformed Churches have in their Synods or other assemblies; only he after the fourth Age held the place and honour for life, as theirs always do not. But this makes no material difference, if Grotius mistake not, who saies, it is not *de re*, but *de habendi modo*. A Dictator made but for the dispatch of some present difficulty, was as much a King (in his account) as he that reigned during life.

g De jure Belli, l. 1. c. 3. Sect. 11.

Duratio naturam rei non immutat 8.

Sect.

Self. 10. He passes to Egypt, and from what *Athanasius* says of *Marcotis*, he draws several Observations, which seem not all current. He observes, 1. That here were true *Parochial Churches*, because they are called Churches: but so were the *Tituli* at Rome called, yet were not better than *Oratories* (or *Chapels* of Ease in many of our Parishes) where all divine Offices were not performed. That they were all performed there, so as the people were not sometimes obliged to have recourse to *Alexandria* for some, one *Athanasius* doth not intimate, nor the Dr. affirm. He observes also that they were so under the Bishop, as that he had the whole Government. But if he had the whole, those Presbyters had none of it; and then he was such a Bishop, and they such Presbyters as that age did not know. This the best Assertors of Episcopacy acknowledge, and Dr. St. hath proved. He observes that they were at that distance, that they could not have local Communion with their Bishop at *Alexandria*. But that the Distance was not such, as to hinder them from having communion with their Bishop, is evident by an Epistle of *Dionysius*, who being banished to *Cephro*, and troubled that afterwards the Governour would remove him to *Coluthion* in *Marcotis*; the Brethren encourage him because, this was so near *Alexandria*, that it might be reputed but a remoter Suburbs, as in *regatimis*; and though the place was destitute of Christians, yet those of *Alexandria* might frequently have recourse to them, and make up a Congregationⁿ.

In Epist. l. 7. c. 11.

But further, not to insist more upon his Observations but the Scope of them, if *Marcotis* was well replenished with Christians when *Athanasius* was made Bishop there, it had not been long so; for *Dionysius* in his time, declares it to be, a desert as to Christians or any good men, *ἐρημὸν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀγαθῶν ἀνθρώπων*.

In l. 11.

It

It was the sence of the Church, (as I shew'd before,) that where Christians were so multiplied in any place, as to need more than one Presbyter, and they desir'd to have a Bishop, it was not to be denied them. If this was now the condition of *Marzotis*, *Athanasius* would not have hinder'd them from having a Bishop: but indeed his Adversaries were too quick for him, and made *Ischyra* Bishop in *Marzotis*. It is true, *Athanasius* was troubled at it, because *Ischyra* was a very bad man, and had this honour as the reward of an ill act; but not because it lessen'd his *Diocese*, or impaired his *Revenues*, (though Countrey *Oblations*, upon which with those of the City, the Bishop and Clergy lived; being withdrawn from the City were allowed to the Countrey Bishop, where a new Bishoprick was erected:.) For he was well enough pleased with others that were deserving in the same Circumstances, particularly with *Dracouris* who was made Bishop in the same Territory of *Alexandria*, *ἢ τῇ Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ*. And more there might be, for in those Parts. as in others, Bishops were seated as little distant one from another, as Countrey Towns are with us. To go no further than the Countrey bordering upon this, in *Palestine*, *Diospolis* or *Lydda* an Episcopal Seat, was but Six Miles from *Joppa*; and *Joppa* some Four Miles from *Jamnia*; *Rhinocorura* four Miles from *Anthedon*; and *Anthedon* not Three Miles (*Sozomen* sayes about Twenty Furlongs ^m) from *Gaza*; and *Gaza* Twenty Furlongs from *Constantia* (antiently *Matama* ⁿ.) *Strabo* makes it little more than Seven Furlongs ^o. In *Egypt* it self, the Cities, (though there were Bishops also in the Countrey) were close together. *Nicopolis* was Twenty Furlongs from *Alexandria*, as *Jos. phus* ^p, or Thirty Furlongs

k *Athan. Apol.*
pag. 622.

l *Epist. ad Dra-*
cont.

m *Hist. Lib. 5.*
cap. 8.
n *Soz. ibid.*
p. 336.
o *Lib. 16.*
p. 522.
p. *De Bello Ju-*
daic. Lib. 5. c.
nlt. q *Lib. 17.*
p. 593.

as *Strabo* 9, and *Taposiris* (near *Nicopolis*,) and *Cano-*^{9 Lib. 17. p. 593.}
pus, *Heraclia*, and *Naucratis* not much further one
 from another. More Instances hereof might be given
 in other Countreys, *Syria*, the lesser *Asia*, *Greece*, *Mace-*
don, and *Italy*, where there are divers Cities but two
 Miles distant, very many at three or four Miles di-
 stance, abundance at five or six; I must not digress
 to give a particular account of them. Those who
 ordained every such City or Town to have a Bi-
 shop, were far from designing any such things as
 modern Dioceses.

"But *M. B's* great argument is, from the meet-
 ing of the whole multitude with *Athanasius* in the
 "great Church at *Alexandria*, to keep the Easter So-
 "lemnity, p. 254.

And there is some weight in it, because nothing
 considerable can be said against it. It amounts to
 more than is said, if a just account be taken of it.
 He tells the Emperour there were *πολλοι*, so many *Chri-*
stians at the Paschal Solemnity, as a Prince that loved
Christ, would wish to be in the City, and that these
 desired to meet in the great Church, that they all might
 pray there, *καὶ οἱ πάντες ἐν ἑαδῇ*, and so they did, *ὅμοι ὡς*
ἕνα. Can this signify any less, than that all the
 Christians in that City which adhered to *Athanasius*,
 did meet and pray in one place? He sayes, that one
 place was capable of receiving them all, *ἑκαδῇ πάντας*.
 He saies the multitudes there met, were such as at
 other times assembled in several other little places,
καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῃ, &c. How (sayes he) did the people rejoyce to see
 one another now, when before they met in several places? Let
 any one view the whole passage, and I doubt not,
 it will be plain to any impartial eye, that the main
 Body of Christians, belonging to *Athanasius*, did meet
 in that one Church. But by this I see nothing will

be plain in *Antiquity*, to him that likes it not. Hereby the *Dr's* following questions are answer'd, p. 255.

It is no good argument, that because all the Christians in *London* can't meet in *Pauls*, therefore all the Christians adhering to *Athanasius* in *Alexandria* could not meet in a great Church. *Alexandria* was never, by far, so populous as *London*, much less at this time. The greatest part of the Inhabitants of that City were at this time *Heathens* or *Jews*. Of those who passed for *Christians*, it is like *Athanasius* had the lesser share. The *Novatians* and other *Sects*, the *Meletians* especially, and the *Arians*, did probably exceed his flock in numbers. It may be the *Arians* alone were more numerous, considering how many they were there at first, and what encouragements and advantages they had under such an Emperour as *Constantinus*; and therefore these Cities are vastly different, in that very thing wherein they should agree, to make such reasoning good, either for proof or illustration. After this time *Epiphanius* mentions about twelve Meeting places in *Alexandria*; whether there were so many now, or whether the *Catholicks* had them all, may be a Question. However *Athanasius* tells us, that all these save one were exceeding small, very short and strait places, τῶν τινῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ὀλίγων καὶ στενῶν.

† *Apol.* p. 531.
‡ *P.* 532.

And after, he sayes, they were μικρὰ καὶ στενὰ. There are as many or more Churches and Chappels, (it's like as great as those in *Alexandria*;) in some one of our Parishes in *England*, the Parishioners assemble in the lesser places at other times, but at some Solemnities they are wont to communicate at the chief Parish Church. Will any argue from such Parishes for our *Dioceses*, or that they could not meet in one place, because they had so many other little places to meet in? There's,

There's no need for the serving *M. B's Hypothesis*, that *Alexandria* be shrunk into a less compass, nor doth *M. B.* in the least attempt it. He gives the full dimensions of that City out of *Strabo*, as grave and judicious a *Geographer*, and every way as unexceptionable, as any he could pitch on; who is so far from lessening it, that he calls it, *μικροῦ τῆς οὐρανίας Ἐμπολεως*, the greatest Mart Town in the World. Yet he might have told us that, *Ausonius* makes it inferior to *Constantinople*, to *Antiochia* and to *Carthage*,^{t Dr. ord. Nob. Urb.} who may pass for as judicious an Author as he that will have it *ἀνύμωτος*, incomprehensibly great. But he detracting nothing from the greatness of that City, offers as fair probabilities, that the Christians in it joining with *Athanasius*, might all meet in one place, as can be expected in such a case; But the *Dr.*^{u Church. Hist. p. 9, 10.} thought not fit to take notice of them.

"To shew the great number of Christians in *Alexandria*, he tells us, pag. 255, 256. long before "the time of *Athanasius*, *Dionysius Alexandrinus* saith, "in a time of great persecution when he was banished, he kept up the Assemblies in the City, and "at *Cephro* he had a large Church, partly of the Christians of *Alexandria* which followed him, and partly "from other places; and when he was removed "thence to *Colluthion*, which was nearer the City, such "numbers of Christians flocked out of the City to "him, that they were forced to have distinct Congregations, so the words *καὶ οὐ μὴν* signifie.

Cephro was a place in *Lybia*, at a great distance from *Alexandria*; in the *Epistle* cited it is a Village near the Desert, and that was no place for very great Assemblies; that which increased it, was the recourse of Christians from some other parts of *Egypt*. However it was greater than what they had or expected,

when removed to *Marcotis*, though so very near to *Alexandria*, as *Dionysius* his friends there signified. But to encourage him, they tell him, as it afterwards fell out, that their Meetings though not so great, might be more frequent, Christians still coming to them from *Alexandria*, one company after another; so that they might often have Assemblies for Worship and Christian Communion at *Colluthion*, though in less numbers than at *Cephro*; and that by the contexture of the discourse seems to be the meaning of *ἡντι μὲν*, their assembling in parcels as they came, some at one time, and others at another; not that such numbers flocked thither at once out of the City, as that they were forced to have distinct Congregations. Indeed a company not very numerous, might be well thought too many for one Assembly in their circumstances, in the Paroxysm of a violent persecution, when *Emilianus* the Governour, passing Sentence of banishment on them, told them, *It should be death to keep a meeting in the place to which they were banished*, and that they should be narrowly watched in order to a discovery: And *Dionysius* says, he was on purpose disposed of in such a place, where he might most easily be apprehended. And therefore if they had met in distinct Congregations at the same time, this had been no argument to prove them so numerous as the *Dr.* is concerned to have them. Less than a thousand, yea, or five hundred will more than satisfy the import of any passage in this *Epistle*, which he makes use of to prove the great numbers of Christians in that City. However, as if his supposition had been proved, he proceeds upon it thus: "If there were such a number of Christians at *Alexandria*, so long before, under the sharpest persecution, is it possible to imagine in so great a City after Christianity had so long been the Religion

"ligion of the Empire, that the number of Christi-
 "ans there should be no greater than to make one
 "large Congregation? p. 256.

The Professors of *Christianity* greatly increased after this became the *Religion* of the *Empire*; but the greatest part of those who professed it, did not adhere to *Athanasius*; both the *Meletians* and the *Arians* fell off from his Predecessors, and the breach continued all his time; so that the *Catholicks* in *Alexandria* seem not to have gained much more by the happy alteration in the *Empire*, than they lost by those unhappy divisions. At the first breach, *Meletius* had many more Adherents than *Peter*, as *Epiphanius* tells us*, *far most of the Bishops, Clergy and People* deserting *Peter* and cleaving to *Meletius*. *Constantine* granted them the liberty of their Meetings, and *Athanasius* who opposed them, was by him Bannished, and so continued many years, (twelve or thirteen) under such encouragements as they had under him and *Constantius*, their numbers were not like to be impaired.

As for the *Arians*, if we may take our measures of the People by their Officers, they were more numerous than the *Catholicks* in this City; for of nine *Presbyters* and *Deacons* which the Church of *Alexandria* had, as *Theodoret* reckons^x, eleven embraced *Arianism*^y. *Constantine*, if he did not favour them, would not oppose them, but was severe against those that did; against *Athanasius* particularly. *Constantius*, his Successor in those parts of the *Empire*, was both Zealous and Industrious in promoting *Arianism*. In these circumstances the *Arians* might well out-vie the followers of *Athanasius* in numbers; and these declined as the other increased; the numbers which these lost, being gained by those. *Alexander*, his immediate

* Hist. l. 4. c. 20.

^x Hist. l. 4. c.

^y 20.

^y See l. 1. c.

14.

Athanas. Ibid.

mediate Predecessor, assembled the main body of his Adherents in *Theonas*, a Church not quite finished, [as *Athanasius* did afterwards in another, and pleads it in excuse of his own Act;] this Church is reckon'd among the other Churches that were *small* and *strait*, though something greater than the rest. Now is it probable that the *Catholicks* there should be so much increased, upon such revolts and under such discouragements, as that those who could meet together in an *ordinary* Church with *Alexander*, should be too many to assemble in a *very great* Church with *Athanasius*? Let the impartial judge who they are that *build Theories upon strange improbabilities*.

2 Ep. 113.

The *Dr.* proceeds, to what he thinks *plain enough* of it self to shew the great extent of *Diocesan Power*, it is that of *Theodore*, where 'tis said he had the charge of eighty Churches^z.

This might be dismissed, as out of the bounds we are concern'd for, being beyond not only the three first, but the fourth Age: for this Epistle, if it be *Theodore's*, was writ about the middle of the fifth Age, when all was tumbling into confusion and degeneracy; Only thus in brief. The passage insisted on runs thus: *In eighty Churches I have been Pastor, for so many Parishes hath Cyrrhus*. *Cyrrhus* here is but capable of three acceptions; it must be taken either for the City alone; or both for the City and the Region; or for the Region alone without the City. Against this *last*, there is an unanswerable exception, the word is never thus used in these Epistles or elsewhere. Nor I think can an instance be given where the proper name of a City, as *Cyrrhus* was, signifies the Countrey alone, and not the City it self. The *second* the *Dr.* rejects, and is concerned to do, seeing if he admitted it, it would entangle him in a difficulty

difficulty that seems inextricable. If the *first* be admitted, it must be granted that *Theodoret* was not the Author of this Epistle, or at least of the passage insisted on, as here expressed. For he who described *Cyrrhus* to be a desolate place, *ἐρημὸν ὡς, καὶ ὀλίγους ἀνθρώπους ἔχοντα*, having few inhabitants, and those poor ^a, *a* Epist. 32. and elsewhere mentions *πολίχνης ἐρημίας*, signifying it to be a small Town in a manner desolate ^b, would neither *b* Epist. 138. say nor dream, that there were eighty Parishes in it. But there's no need to insist on this or other probabilities, that this Epistle is spurious, or this passage corrupted. That which the *Dr.* delivers in his discourse upon it, is enough to shew, that it will not serve his design, nor is pertinent to the Scope he proposes. He tells us in that Province (called *Regio Cyrrhæstica*) there was a Metropolitan of *Hazipolis*, which by the ancient *Nectis*, appears to have been then, one of the names of *Cyrus* or *Cyrrhus*, p. 258.

If this be so, then *Theodoret* must be a Metropolitan, and himself seems to signify no less, when he tells us he ordained *Irenæus* a Bishop ^c. For though *c* Epist. 110. others were wont to concur with the Metropolitan in ordaining a Bishop, yet the act is still ascribed to the Metropolitan (being chief therein,) as if he alone did it. So that when but one Ordainer of a Bishop is mentioned, regularly, that one must be taken for a Metropolitan. He tells us also, that the reason of his Confinement, alledged in the Imperial Order for that purpose was, because he was still convalescing Synods ^d, and that in those times is taken to be the privilege of a Metropolitan. But there needs no other proof of it; for since it is plain by the *Nozitia*, and acknowledged by the *Dr.* that *Cyrus* was a Metropolitan, none will question but the Bishop of it was a Metropolitan. And if *Theodoret* was a Metropolitan

d Epist. 79, 80, 81, 82.
Council Antioch.
Can. 19. 20.

tropolitan, these eighty Churches will shew not the extent of *Diocesan*, but *Metropolitan* Power. None ever doubted but *Theodore* was Bishop of this City *Cyrus*, he himself declares it plainly and frequently. It's said, he was confined to *Cyrus* being Bishop of that City^e; and that he was confined to his own home by the Emperours Law, forbidding him to go out of the bounds of that City^e. He sayes, this City was committed to his charge & τῷ ἐκχειρῶσαι ἡμῖν πόλιν, and since he was the Bishop of the City *Cyrus*, that being a *Metropolis*, *Theodore* must be the *Metropolitan*. For if he was only Bishop there, but another and not he there *Metropolitan*, there will be two Bishops in that City; which must in no case be admitted against the Dr's inviolable rule.

How this will be avoided I know not. But the Dr. will have the eighty Churches to be in *Theodore*'s *Diocese*; and why so? Because *Theodore* mentions the *Metropolitan* he was under. But so might any other *Metropolitan* in those parts do, without danger of losing his Province. For all the *Metropolitans* in the *Diocese* of the *Orient* (wherein, according to the *Notitia* of the *Empire*, there are fifteen Provinces, but by the *Ecclesiastical Notitia* many more *Metropolitans* and Arch-bishops, though divers of them pass as ἀντιόχεια) were under him of *Antioch*, which City *Jerome* calls the *Metropolis* of the *Orient*; Ut *Palestina Metropolis Cesarea* sit, & totius *Orientis Antiochia*^h, & *Zozimus*ⁱ; πῶς τῆς ἑλίας μετροπόλεως *Theodore* saies (that having ruled that Church committed to him at *Cyrus* twenty six years^k) he had Preached six years under *Theodorus* Bishop of *Antioch*; thirteen years under *John*; and it was now the seventh year since *Domnus* was Arch-bishop there^l. But that he was under any other *Metropolitan* of *Cyrus* (or else-where)

^h *Advers. Job. Hierosol.*

ⁱ *Hist. Lib. 1.*

^k *Epist. 113.*

^l *Epist. 83. v. 13.*

Epist. 81. 113.

where) he never sayes nor intimates, and when the Dr. has inquired fully into it, I doubt not but he will find it a groundless imagination.

Since *Cyrrhus* is acknowledged to be a *Metropolis*, and thereupon it can no way be denied, but *Theodoret* the Bishop of it was a *Metropolitan*; this might be improved further for our *Author's* satisfaction, if we could know certainly how many Bishops were in this *Province*: but for any thing I can yet discover, we must be content with conjectures. The Dr. tells us from *Victor*, that *Crescens* had one hundred and twenty Bishops in his *Province*: in that of *Zengi-tana* it is said there was one hundred sixty four Bishops, afterwards reduced to three, by the severities of *Genfericus* the *Vandal*^m. In other *African Pro-*^{m Victor. de per-}
^{sec. Vandal. Lib.}
vinces there must be as many or more, to make up the account we have of the many hundred Bishops in *Africa*. If the Bishops under the *Metropolitan* of *Cyrrus*, were so many as in one of these *Provinces*, and these eight hundred Churches distributed amongst them, the share of each Bishop would scarce be more than some one of our *Parishes*. Or if the Bishops there were supposed to be fewer, yet would their Bishopricks be more like some *Parishes*, than *modern Dio-*
ceses.

“By *Cyrrus* therefore we understand the Region about the City, which was under *Theodoret's* care.

He means the Region, and not the City. But I suppose none else will see any reason so to understand it, since it cannot be found, that *Cyrrus* is ever any where else so understood: Nor that the name of any other City doth signify the Countrey and not the City. It is as if it should be said, by *London* we understand *Essex*, but not the *City of London*. *Cyrrus* was the proper Name of the City (as some think, because

n Epist. 81.
& 79.

it was built by *Cyrus*, and it's call'd by others *Cyropolis*) but the Countrey about it had another Name, and call'd by *Theodoret Cyrrhestica Regio*ⁿ, as the *Dr.* himself observes: Besides, this makes *Theodoret*, not to have been Bishop of the City *Cyrus*, but only of the Region about it, which contradicts *Theodoret* in many plain Passages, wherein he declares expressly that he was Bishop of that City. Of which before.

'*Theodoret* himself sets down the Extent of it, 'wherein he sayes it was Forty Miles in length, 'and Forty in breadth.

But how doth it appear that this was the Extent of *Theodoret's Diocese*, and not of the *Province*? That's it which is Questioned, and should have been proved. Seeing there were many considerable Cities in that Province, if each of them had a Diocese of such Dimensions (and no Reason to think that *Cyrus* exceeded them herein) this one Province will be far larger than all *Syria* besides.

'He saith in another Epistle, that Christianity was 'then so much spread among them, &c.

What he sayes concerning the spread of Christianity, respects not that *Region* peculiarly, but concerns the *Christian World*, (as will appear to those that view it) though whether it do or no, is not Material. That which he seems to think of more consequence for the overthrowing of *Mr. B.'s Hypothesis*, he thus delivers. 'That these Villages had Churches 'and Priests settled in them under the care of the Bishop, 'appears from a passage in the Life of *Simon*, where he 'speaks of *Bassus* visiting the Parochial Churches, &c.

Theodoret speaks not of *Bassus* visiting Parochial Churches, but Villages: his Words are, *He then Perambulated many Villages, inspecting the Sacred Persons* (or Priests) *there*. *Bassus*, the Visitor who made this
Peram-

Perambulation, was a *Monastick*, and a *Rector* of Monks. *Theodoret* in the same place tell's us, his *Sodality* consisted of above two Hundred, which he calls his *proper Flock*, *οικειαν ἀγέλην*, and gives an Account of the *Rules* he prescribed. But suppose *Bassus* was a Bishop, either these Villages which he Perambulated were in *Theodoret's* Diocese, or no. If they were in his Diocese, then was there more than one Bishop in one Diocese. If they were not in it, how does this serve in the least to prove the Extent of *Theodoret's* Diocese, which he is here designing to manifest? Nor will this prove *Bassus* to have been a *Diocesan*, where ever those Villages were which he visited. There are *Rectors* in *England*, who have many Villages in their Parishes, and *Presbyters* in them, whom they may visit when they please, yet none take them to be *Diocesans*.

“He saith he had brought Ten Thousand *Marcionists* to Baptism.

It is, as he expresses it, *more than Ten Thousands*, but this in all Reason must be taken indefinitely, for very many, seeing in his Epistle to *Leo*, it is but *πλείους ἢ χίλιαι*, *more than a Thousand* °. And this is more like to be the Number in *Eight Villages* (which being tainted with the Heresie of *Marcion*, he reduced to the Truth P) than many *Myriads*; unless he will have each Village to be more Populous, than the Mother City it self. However *Theodoret* doth not say that these *Eight Villages* were in his Diocese; and he might think himself concern'd to reduce them, though they were but in his *Province*. ° Epist. 113.

“And we find the Names of many of the Villages ‘in his Lives, as *Tillima*, &c. Which are sufficient ‘to shew that *Theodoret* had properly a *Diocesan* ‘Church, &c. P Epist. 11.

It doth not appear in the places cited that all these five were in his Dioceſe, but if there had been more than theſe five, or more than the eight forementioned, it would not be ſufficient to ſhew that Theodoret had properly a Dioceſan Church, unleſs there be ſufficient in ſeveral of our Countrey Pariſhes (containing as many Villages,) to ſhew that they are properly Dioceſan Churches. Some other Writings than Theodoret's *Epistles* or *Lives* muſt be made uſe of, if he hopes to make good a Dioceſan Episcopacy, like ours, in the ancient Church.

The other point, wherein the Dr. makes uſe of ancient Authorities, is about popular Elections. He ſeems willing to maintain, that the people in the ancient Church, had not the power to chuſe their own Biſhops, but only to give teſtimony of their good or bad lives. I was ſomething ſurprized at this undertaking, and having ſeen ſo clear and full evidence for the peoples priviledge herein, as hath convinced many learned *Papiſts* and others, whoſe intereſt ſwayed them the other way; I was ready to think, that thoſe who would contradict it, might be ſuſpected, either to want acquaintance with the ancient Records and uſages of the Church, or fidelity in reporting them. The learned and ingenuous Dr. is not to be ſuſpected as to either of theſe: only perſons of ſingular learning and other accompliſhments, may venture ſometimes to defend a Paradox and run againſt the Stream; and if they can with cogent arguments, detect a vulgar error, the more common it is, the more excellent ſervice will they do. But if they bring only ſtraws againſt a Torrent, or ſhew themſelves reſolved to ſerve a particular Intereſt, rather than to uſe impartial judgment, and yield to evidence; though they may prevail with ſome that are weak and prepoſſeſſed

possessed, yet they will scarce thereby advance their Reputation with the truly *judicious*. However the *best* that can be looked for in this cause, may be expected from the *Dr.* and what it is, is now to be considered.

He layes down several *Observations*. "The first of them is this, That the main ground of the People's interest, was founded upon the Apostles Canon, that a Bishop must be blameless and of good report^a, p. 312, 313.

^a 1 Tim. 3. 2. 7.

This rule of the *Apostle's* was one ground, upon which the peoples *interest* in the choice of their Bishop and other Officers was founded; but it was not the only ground. *Cyprian*, *Chrysostome* and others, conclude it from other places of Scripture. But this might be sufficient, if there were no other, to found their *right* or *power* in *elections*. For the *testimony* required, was not only of their good or ill behaviour, which a *Heathen* might give; but such as signified that they judged them *fit* and *worthy* to be, and so *desired* them for, their Officers; which is not a meer *declarative* testimony, but such as is *elective*. And this will be cleared by the *Authors* which the *Dr.* cites afterwards.

"Pag. 314. And there is a very considerable testimony in the Epistle of *Clemens* to this purpose, "where he gives an account how the Apostles, preaching through Cities and Countreys, did appoint their first fruits, having made a spiritual trial of them, to be Bishops and Deacons of those who were to believe.

By the Apostles *appointing*, may be meant, either the *instituting* of those Offices, and then it is not for the *Dr's* purpose; or else their *fixing* those Officers in particular places. That they *fixed* Officers in any places

places where there were no Christians, is an Imagination which he doth not seem to own; and where there was Christians, *Clemens* tells us afterwards, how their Officers were appointed, viz. with the *ap- probation or choice of the whole Church*.

“ Here it is plain they were of the Apostles appointment, and not of the Peoples choice. *Ibid.* ”

This is no way plain, an hundred instances might be produced of Officers appointed for a People, and yet chosen by them. But there needs no more than the *Dr.* helps us to in this very page. Immediately before these words, he mentions the first choice of *Deacons*, and there it is plain and express by the Text, that they were chosen by the People, and yet appointed by the Apostles. And in the words of *Clemens*, cited presently after, Bishops are to be chosen, and yet also appointed by the Apostles, or other eminent men. The *Dr.* thus renders his words: “ There- fore foreseeing these things perfectly, they appointed the persons before mentioned, and left the distribution of their Offices with this instruction, that as some dyed, other approved men should be chosen into their Offices. How and by whom they are to be chosen, the next words express, *οὐρανὸν ἐκράναντες πάντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, the whole Church having approved them, i. e. having signified that they thought them worthy, and most fit to be their Officers, which includes a desire that they be appointed or set over them, This declared either when they are proposed by themselves or others, is the choice we are concerned for. Here 'tis manifest by *Clemens*, that this was the Apostles practice, and that they left order that in after-times Bishops should be thus appointed, and thus chosen.

The *Dr.* makes some Observations upon this Testimony

mony of *Clemens*, pag. 315. *First*, "That these Officers of the Church were not chosen by the People, but appointed by the Apostles, or other great men according to their order.

Whereas by *Clemens* his words it is plain to the contrary, that these Officers of the Church were both *chosen by the people*, and *appointed by the Apostles*, and that according to their order. They ordained, that their own practice in appointing Officers should be followed in after-times, *viz.* that as some dyed, others should be *chosen, the whole Church approving them*, into their Office, and *appointed thereto by other eminent men*. This is the plain import of *Clemens* his words.

"2. He observes, that they took this course on purpose to prevent the *contentions* that might happen in the Church, about those who should bear Office in it.

The course he means is the *appointing* of Officers, without the *choice* of the People. But this appears to be a mistake, and if it were not so, the universal Church both in the *best* Ages and *many* after, did run counter to the order of the *Apostles*, made on purpose to prevent *contentions* in the Church.

"3. He observes, that all that the people had to do, was to give *testimony*, or to express their *approbation* of those who were so appointed.

But *Clemens* speaks nothing of a bare testimony. He speaks expressly of *all the peoples approbation* as requisite by the *Apostles* order, and this, we have shewed, imports no less than the peoples choice; and this in the constant sense and practice of the Church was previous to the settling of any *Pastor* over them. Yet he adds; "For he could not allow their power of choosing, since he says the *Apostles* appointed Officers

“ficers to prevent the contentions that might happen
“about it.

But it *doth* not appear that they appointed Officers to prevent the contentions in Elections, nor can it appear by any thing Clemens sayes, but rather the contrary, since he tells us, Officers were both to be approved (or, which is all one, chosen) by the People, and appointed by the Apostles. And this leaves no ground for his following Supposition, that the Cause of the disturbance made by some Men in the Church of Corinth, was because their Officers were appointed by others, not chosen by themselves. What pretence could there be for this, when according to the Apostles Order, (to which that Church was conform'd,) no Officer was appointed without the approbation of the whole Church?

‘Pag. 316. And this is plain even from St. Cyprian, where he Discourseth of this matter, &c. for the force of what St. Cyprian saith, comes at last only to this giving Testimony.

But what if in Cyprian, the Peoples giving Testimony be no less than Chusing by Suffrage? The Clergy had no less Interest in the Election of a Bishop than the People, yet he expresses the Clergies concurrence in the Choice, by their Testimony, and the Peoples by their Suffrage ^b. Factus est Cornelius Episcopus—de Clericorum penè omnium Testimonio, de Plebis qua tunc affuit Suffragio: Cornelius was made Bishop by the Testimony of almost all the Clergy, and by the Suffrage of the People that were present. And in the same place he saith, Cornelius was Ordained both by the Suffrage of the Clergy and the People. In the very next passage, cited by the Dr. out of this blessed Martyr, there is an Intimation of a Testimony in the Peoples presence, but the Suffrage of all is expressly mentioned, as requisite,

^b Epist. 52.

site, *that the Ordination may be Just and Lawful.* Take it as the *Dr.* offers it, *pag. 316.* that by 'their presence, either their faults might be Published, or their 'good acts Commended; that so it *may appear to be* 'a *Just and Lawful Ordination, which hath been examined* 'by the *Suffrage and Judgment of all.*

'To this he adds, the People there had a share in 'the Election, but it was in matter of Testimony concerning the good or ill behaviour of the Person.

It is as plain, as one would desire it should be spoken, that the People had such a *share* in the Elections as that they were carried by their general *Suffrage*; and this was so necessary, that the Ordination of a Bishop could not *appear to be Just or Lawful without it.* If their *giving Testimony* amount to *no less*, than the Peoples *Choice* by suffrage, the Popular Elections which are in Question are granted: But if it be *less*, and Cyprian be said to allow the People *no more*; violence is offer'd to his Words, plainly expressed, and more than once repeated.

The *Original* of this Practice (the People thus chusing their Bishop) and the universal Observance of it, is next expressed. He had said before that it did *de Divinâ Autoritate descendere, descend to them from Divine Authority*, that it was *Secundum Divina Magisteria, according to Divine Edicts.* Here he says, it is of *Divine delivery* and *Apostolical Observance*, and as such to be *diligently kept and upheld.* And for the *Extent* of it, he says, It was *Observed almost through all Provinces.* He speaks modestly, for there might be some Provinces which he was not acquainted with, or some where Christianity did not yet prevail. The *Dr.* renders his Words thus, 'And therefore, he saith, It was almost a general custom 'among them, and he thinks came down from *Di-*

4 ^{wise} Tradition and Apostolical Practice, that when any People wanted a Bishop, Neighbour Bishops met together in that place, and the new Bishop was Chosen, *Plebe prasente*, the People being present (not by the Votes of the People.)

The People being present, not by the Votes of the People, as the Dr. notes. But Cyprian had said a little before, that it was *Omnium Suffragio*, by all their Votes; and he says it again in that Period, and the very next Words to these which the Dr. Translates, though he thought not fit to add them. And this was Observed in the Consecration of their fellow Bishop Sabinus; (so far the Dr. but Cyprian goes on) *Ut de universæ Fraternitatis Suffragio*, that by the Voices of all the Brethren, and the Judgment of the Bishops that were present, the Bishoprick might be conferred on him, and hands laid on him instead of Basilides. And he says it in divers other Epistles besides this. He declares, Cornelius was made Bishop, *de Plebis Suffragio*, by the Votes of the People, and that he was Ordained, *Cleri & Plebis Suffragio*, by the Suffrage of the Clergy and the People^c. He tells his own People, that those who were against his being Bishop, were against their Suffrage (which he elsewhere Styles, *Divina Suffragia*) and against the Judgment of God^d.

Where he doth express the Consent of the People, but he requires the Judgment of the Bishops.

He expresses the Consent of the People declared by their Votes, as previous to the Ordination, and the way whereby Sabinus came to be Bishop. And whereas the Dr. seems to intimate, that Judgment was more than Consent: if it was more, yet was it not thought too much for the People. In this Epistle it is said to be of Divine Authority, that the Bishop be Chosen in the presence of all, and approved by the Publick Judgment as worthy

c Ep. 52.

d Ep. 40.

worthy and fit for the Office ; and afterwards , that the Ordination may be Just and Lawful, he sayes, it is to be examined by the Judgment of all.

Vid. Ep. 41.

“ St. Cyprian and the African Bishops, who write this Epistle to the People, say, *That it belonged chiefly to them, to chuse the good, and refuse the bad,* which is the strongest Testimony in Antiquity for the Peoples Power.

It is a strong and clear Testimony , and in Truth all the Dr.'s attempts to weaken it, have made it appear stronger to me than it did before. There's no fear but it will stand firm and unmoved, whoever would shake it ; when the attaques of a Person of such excellent Learning and other Abilities can make no more impression on it.

But let us view the particulars he thinks fit to be considered. “ 1. It was in a case where a Bishop had voluntarily resigned.

But the Rule laid down by Cyprian and his Colleagues is general, asserting the Power of the People in all Cases, for choosing such as were worthy, and rejecting the unworthy.

“ 2. Another Bishop was put into his room, not by the Power of the People, but by the Judgment and Ordination of the Neighbour Bishops.

It is as plain as can be spoken, that Sabinus was put into the room of Basilides, not only by the Judgment and Ordination of the Bishops, but also by the Power of the Peoples Votes, *de universæ Fraternitatis Suffragio*. Nay, the African Fathers determine, that the People have most of all this Power, *Plebs maximè potestatem habet, &c.*

“ 3. They had the judgment of a whole Council of African Bishops for their deserting him.

G 2 And

And we have in this *Epistle* the judgment, not only of *Cyprian*, but of a whole Council of *African Bishops*, both for the power and manner of the peoples chusing; the *divine authority* for it, and the *universality* of the practice; and also for their *Power* of deserting those Bishops which deserved it. The Names of above thirty of those Bishops are prefixed to this *Epistle*.

“4. For a notorious matter of fact, *viz.* Idolatry “and Blasphemy, by his own confession.

The rule of the *African Fathers* is *general*, and not confined to this particular case, nor the grounds of it; but extends to any other wickedness, which may render Bishops unworthy to be owned.

“5. All the proof which *St. Cyprian* brings for “this, doth amount to no more than that the People were most concerned to give testimony as to the “good or bad lives of their Bishops.

Cyprian and the Council of Bishops with him, prove what they say concerning the power of the people in this matter; and they say not only that the people are to be present when a Bishop is to be ordained, and to give testimony concerning his good or ill deportment; but also that their consent is requisite; their judgement is to be interposed in examining, and approving such as are offer'd; and that they have the greatest power in chusing and rejecting Bishops; and that Elections are to be made by their concurring Votes and suffrage, that so the ordination of a Bishop may be just and lawful; and judge they are lead to this by *divine Authority*. This is evident by the *Synodical Epistle* and the *Premises*. Now let any that are impartial, and are not willing to be lead into mistakes, judge whether this amount to no more, than only the peoples giving testimony concerning the good or bad lives of their Bishops: This is no more than the Heathens had

had liberty to do in the ordinations of Bishops, and can any one imagine that all the expressions in this *Epistle*, concerning the *power* and *privilege* of Christians in the choice of those *Pastors* who were entrusted with their Souls, amount to no more than what *infidels* might challenge in reference to Christian Bishops? In another case one would be apt to think, that he who thus represents *ancient* Authors, did not take the course to be trusted in reporting matters of Antiquity. But in this case, I would not give way to such a thought, but honour the *Dr.* more, than he hath done himself in this business.

Bishop *Bilson*, a very learned *Prelate*, who was little more a friend to popular Elections than the *Dr.* (and had produced as much against them as any, *Bellarmino* not excepted, if not *all* that others have made use of since) yet was so ingenuous as to yield *that* in antiquity, which cannot modestly be denied. "The fullest words, (says he) that the "Greek Authors use for all the parts of *Election*, as "to *Propose*, to *Name*, to *Chuse*, to *Decree*, are in the "stories Ecclesiastical applied to the *people*. And afterwards thus: So that in the *Primitive Church*, the "people did *Propose*, *Name*, *Elect* and *Decree*, as well "as the *Clergy*; and though the *Presbyters* had more "skill to judge, yet the *people* had as much Right "to chuse their *Pastor*, and if the most part of them "did agree, they did carry it from the *Clergy*, &c.

Alexander Severus, in proposing the names of his Officers to the *People*, to hear what they had to object against them, did but imitate *part* of the Christians practice, and a small part of it too, and what was not the peculiar privilege of Christians; for Heathens had the like liberty, and their objections might be heard in reference to the *Candidates* for

Church

c Perpet. Govern. of the Church, c. 15. p. 359. 560.

Church Offices. And therefore it is no wonder, if *no man can hence imagine that the people had power to make the Governours of Roman Provinces*. But if the people of these Provinces had obtained as much power to chuse those Governours, as the Christians had to elect their Bishops, and the Emperour could have no more declined whom they had chosen in one case, than the Ordainers could in the other; the former might as well have been said to make their Governours, as the latter are said to make their Bishops. With Chrysostome they are, τῶ δέοντι νόμιμον τὸν πληθὸν †. And in Epiphanius, οἱ λαοὶ — ἐκποιῶντες ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἀντιθέμενοι, they make Bishops for themselves.

† De Sacerdot.
Orat. 3.
g Her. 73. Num.
28.

Origen hath nothing, either in the Words as they are cited, or as indeed they are in the Homily, against Elections by the People *de jure* or *de facto*; nor any thing which signifies that the People of Christ had no more to do in the choice of their Pastors, than meerly giving a Declarative Testimony, such as the Heathen were allowed to give, and therefore I wave it.

“The 2^d. Considerable is, that the People upon this “Assuming the Power of Elections caused great disturbances and disorders in the Church.

The People Assumed not the Power of Elections at any time which can be assigned after the beginning of Christianity; they had it at first. If the People took to themselves any Power herein, which was not their proper Right, they Usurped it, and the Usurpation is to be charged, not upon the People alone, but the whole Church; for both Clergy and People concurred in those Elections, and made account they had Apostolical Warrant for it, and were taught so to do, by Cyprian, and others of the Ancients. That it was the practice of the Church every where for the People to Chuse their own Pastors, is evident by those in-

instances which are here brought against it; for there could be no disturbances or disorders in their *Choice*, if they did not *Chuse*. And the *disturbances* and *disorders* Objected, when duly weighed, can raise no prejudice against the universal practice of the Church, nor will be any just occasion to deprive the People of that Power which was by them exercised; and is acknowledged by the *Ancient* Church to be their Right for so many Hundred Years, without any attempt to divest them of it; though they were well acquainted with any disorders that fell out in the exercise thereof.

There is evidence that this was the practice of the Church for above a Thousand Years after *Christ*, there are about Ten *instances* of disorders therein, *great* and *small*, for so many Ages. Now if every order and usage, though of *Apostolical* Institution or allowance, should be exploded, because of some disorder happening about it once in a *Hundred* Years; what would be left us that is Primitive or Ancient?

But here we have but Four *instances* of any disturbance or disorders about Popular Elections that are considerable in this Case; the rest he thinks not worthy of much notice, or fit to be insisted on: And so they are huddled up without giving us the Words of his *Authors*, or sufficient Direction where to find divers of them. As for the Four which he makes and gives more account of, there are some mistakes about them, (such as I never Observed the *Dr.* to be liable to in any *other Cause*,) which set right, the instances will not be Serviceable to his purpose.

"He begins with the disorders at *Antioch* thus,
 "pag. 318. *Ensebius* represents the disorders at *Antioch* to have been so great in the City, upon the
 "Choice of a New Bishop, by the divisions of the
 "People.

"People, that they were like to have shaken the
 " *Emperours* kindness to the *Christians*, &c : And af-
 "ter much trouble to the Emperour, and many meet-
 "ings of Bishops, at last *Eustathius* was Chosen.

Eustathius was not Chosen at the end of those trou-
 bles, but being Chosen peaceably long before, his *De-*
position was the beginning of them ; nor was he ever
 after, there Chosen or Restored. He was Deposed
 by a Synod of *Arian* Bishops at *Antioch*, under a pre-
 tence that he was a *Sabellian* (as the *Arians* were
 wont to Brand those, who opposed their *Hereſie*) so

^h *Lib. 1. C. 23.* *Socrates* ^h. Those of that *Faction* in the Town would
 have Chosen (in the place of *Eustathius*, wrong-
 fully ejected.) *Eusebius Pamphilus*, then Bishop of *Ce-*
sarea, whom they took to be of that Perswasion ; and
 so violent and irregular were their proceedings there-
 in, not only to the disturbing of the Civil Peace,
 but violating the Constitutions of the Church, (offer-
 ing to Chuse one who was Bishop of another Place ;
 as the Emperour signifies ⁱ) that all the disturbance
 may be justly imputed to them, as *Aggressors*, thrust-
 ing out him who had the Right, and striving to
 force in him who could have none. Now is it fair,
 to make use of the violent attempts of the *Arians*,
 Enemies of the Church and the common Faith ; to
 derive Odium upon the practice of the *Catholick*
 Church ?

ⁱ *Euseb. de vita*
Constantini.
^{l.} 3. c. 57.

"The next is at *Cesarea*. *Gregory Nazianzen* sets
 " forth the mighty unruliness of the People of *Cesa-*
 " *rea* in the Choice of their Bishop, saying, it came
 " to a dangerous Sedition, and not easie to be sup-
 " pressed, &c. pag. 318, 319.

We find two hot *Contests* in Elections there, one
 immediately after the other : whether of them he
 means, helps us not understand. The first was about
 the

the Choice of *Eusebius*. *Nazianzen* (who alone is said to complain of the *mighty unruliness* of the People) says no worse of it in the issue than this, that they proceeded indeed *not very orderly*, *καὶ λίαν ὑπερέκτατος*, but *very faithfully and zealously*^k, and thereby signifies how horribly Seditious it was in his account. And his Father, the *Senior Gregory*, Bishop of *Nazianzum*, justifies the Action in *Letters* to the Governour as *regular*, and *acceptable* to God, and defends what they did as, *ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ δικαίως*, done *rightly and justly*^l. The other Contest was in the Choice of *Basil*, and he, justly styled a Person of *incomparable worth*, carried it, though with some difficulty (the *Rulers* and the *worst* of the People joining with them, making some opposition.) There was no need to have reckoned these among the *most dangerous Seditions*, they might have been passed by, but only that *Nazianzen* complains so much of the inconvenience of Popular Elections, that he *wished them alter'd*, and the *Elections brought to the Clergy*, as the *Dr.* tells us. Some observe that *Nazianzen* had sometimes *Wishes*, which would now be counted odd and untoward. Once he *Wished* that there were no *Episcopal Preeminence*, no *πρεσβεία*, by which that *Preeminence* is most commonly expressed, both by himself and others^m. Another time he was ready to *Wish* there were no *Synods of Bishops*, and was resolved, for his part, *never to come at any, having never seen any good Issue of them*. But he was a very excellent Person, and should not be wronged. He did not *Wish*, what is here said, *That Elections might be brought to the Clergy* (that is, the Clergy alone; that must be the meaning, or else he is made to *Wish* for that, which he had already) he would not have the Power lie in them *only*, but *in them and the Select and more Holy part of the People*;

^k Orat. 19.
pag. 308.

^l Ibid. pag. 310.

^m Orat. 28.

n Orat. 19.
pag. 310.

τῶ ἐκρίνω ἢ καθαρτάσω) neither in both these *only*, but *in them only*, or chiefly, ἢ ὅτι μάλισσιν.

The Third Instance hath no less of mistake in it, or rather more, such as renders it wholly impertinent. "It is a Sedition at *Alexandria*. *Evagrius* saith, The Sedition at *Alexandria* was intolerable, upon the division of the People between *Dioscorus* and *Proterius*, the People rising against the Magistrates and Souldiers who endeavoured to keep them in order, and at last they Murther'd *Proterius*, Pag. 319.

o Euagr. l. 2.
cap. 5.

But this Sedition was not raised at the Election of *Proterius*, who succeeded *Dioscorus*, but after he was Installed, and Confirmed, by the common Suffrage of a meeting at *Alexandria*. No part of the Tumult but was some time after this, but the most Tragical part, when *Proterius* was Murther'd, was Five or Six Years after. And shall Popular Elections be decry'd upon the account of a Sedition whereof nothing appeared at the Election? Besides, those who moved Sedition and committed the said outrages, were Enemies of the Council of *Chalcedon*, and of the Faith then maintained against *Eutyches*. These were the chief Actors, and the Incendiaries were *Timotheus Aelurus*, some Bishops and Monks, who upon that account had separated from the Catholic Church, as the Egyptian Bishops and Clergy shew in their Narrative sent to *Leo the Emperour*. Now shall the People who adhere to the common Faith suffer in their Power or Liberty, because some Hereticks in opposition to them do act outrageously?

p Idem. ibid. c. 8.

"He proceeds to another at *Rome* upon the Choice of *Damasus*, which came to Bloodshed for several dayes, and is particularly related by *Ammianus Marcellinus*, &c.

Am-

Ammianus in the *Book cited*, discovers the rise and ground of that outrageous action, to which it may be truly ascribed, and without which the election might have been as orderly and innocent, as in other places. After he had described this *Church Tragedy*, in which a hundred thirty seven persons were slain, he adds, *I cannot deny considering the pomp and bravery at Rome, but those that aspire to that (Bishoprick) should with all their might strive to attain it, since having compassed it, they will be at once enriched Matronarum oblationibus, with the oblations of Matrons, carried abroad in Chariots, speciously attired, and faring so deliciously, that their Feasts are more than Princely, so that the riches, state, and pleasures wherewith the Chair at Rome accomodated those Bishops, incited them to make their way to it with all the force they could engage, though they could not pass but through blood and slaughters. Then he subjoyns, they might have been happy (and so avoided this and other miseries) if despising this grandeur, they would have imitated the Bishops in the Provinces, whose poor fare, and mean habit, and humble lowly carriage, commended them both to God and good men.* The smallness and poorness of the *Bishopricks* in other places, secured them from such scandalous proceedings, and temptations to them. We hear no complaints of any outrages or irregularities in elections to such *Bishopricks*, nor to any that were of the ancient and *primitive form and state*. Not one instance is brought for three hundred years after *Christ*, of any such disorders in the Choice of Bishops. But as *Bishopricks* transgressed the ancient bounds, and swelled bigger and bigger, distempers increased accordingly, and had their *paroxysms* now and then, such as this at *Rome*. These are not natural to elections by the people, their order and inno-

ence for so many Ages, shews it, but *accidental*, and *occasional*; and when the disorders are ascribed to their true and proper causes and occasions, these elections will be acquitted. When the *World* was let into the *Church*, and the *Church* cast into the model of the *Empire*, no wonder if the *Church-men* acted where they had temptations, and would have others act like the men of this *World*.

But are these tolerable inconveniencies? The worst of them are no ways in the nature of the thing, but occasioned by accidents foreign to it, and such as may fall out in the best institutions the Church has and observes; and how intolerable soever they may seem, the ancient Church thought it more intolerable to exclude the people from the liberty of choosing.

What is alledged out of *Chrysostome*, *Jerome*, and *Origen*, with some reflection upon the people, I need not examine, unless it were of more moment. If it be not applicable to those who succeed the people in this power; yet did not these excellent persons think it a sufficient ground to decry the *current practice* and *sense* of the Church, by which popular elections were upheld and maintained, both in their times and long after.

Come we to the *third* thing he will have us consider, "pag. 320. To prevent these inconveniencies many Bishops were appointed, without the Choice of the people, and Canons were made for the regulation of elections. In the Church of *Alexandria*, the Choice of the Bishop belonged to the twelve Presbyters, who was to be chosen not only out of the twelve Presbyters, but by them. For this *Jerome*, *Severus*, &c. are cited.

But *Jerome* did not say, that the Bishop was chosen

sen by the Presbyters, but out of them, *Unum ex se* (not à se) *electum Episcopum nominabant* 9. Nor doth Severus, as he is cited, say that it belonged to the Presbyters alone. And if there be no evidence that they did it alone, we need not be solicitous about what *Elmacinus* saith concerning its original or continuance. The alteration which *Hilary* speaks of, concerns not those who were to chuse, but those out of whom the Bishop was to be chosen. Formerly one of these Presbyters was to be elected, but now the most deserving person might be chosen, whether of that body or not. So he not speaking of any change made as to the *Electors*, for any thing he sayes, the same persons who did chuse in his time, did so before; and the Electors in that age were not only the Presbyters, but both Clergy and people, not in other Churches alone, but this particularly of *Alexandria*, as appears by the election of *Athanasius*, Peter and other Bishops there, made *Ἰσὼ τῷ λαῷ παρρέτ.*

9 *Epist. ad Evagr.*

r *Naz. Orat. 21.*
Theodor. l. 4. c.
 18.

But though that of *Jerome*, on whom the rest cited depend, will not serve to prove the sole power of Presbyters to chuse; yet it may be a proof of their power to do something greater, viz. to ordain their Bishops. And this use is made of it by very learned persons, and particularly (not to mention the most excellent *Primate Usber*) by *D. St.* whom we may see arguing it, like himself, with learning and judgment.

s *Hen. pag. 273.*

He seems not unwilling that what the counterfeit *Ambrose* speaks of the Bishops dying, and the next in course succeeding, should pass for a particular conceit of that Author; and with more reason may it so pass, if he would have the next succeed though not worthy; or the people no way to interpose their judgment concerning such unworthiness. But of this he expresses nothing.

“H2

He proceeds, pag. 321. "We find the Bishops consecrating others in several Churches, without any mention of choice made by the People.

But this is no tolerable arguing, *there is no mention of any*, therefore *there was none*. Otherwise where a Bishop is said to be made, and no mention made of any Ordination, but only of Election by the People, it might be concluded that a Bishop had no Ordination. As when Nazianzen speaks of Athanasius's coming to the Chair at Alexandria by the Votes of all the People, without mentioning his Ordination^t; and when Jerome speaks of a Bishop elected by the People, with-

^t Orat. 21.

P. 377.

u In Epist. l. 10.

c. 33.

out any mention of his Ordination^u, would it be thought tolerable to inferre from hence that a Bishop was made without Ordination? Or when one is said to be constituted Bishop of a Church, without mention either of Election or Ordination, doth it follow that he was made Bishop there without either? An hundred Instances hereof may be found in Eusebius, the Author cited; but we need go no further than the very place which the Dr. makes use of. Eusebius sayes, that Germanio succeeded Dios in the Bishoprick at Jerusalem, and after him Gordius, in whose time Narcissus returned^{*}; he mentions no Ordination or Election of either. And Alexander was settled Bishop there, by the desires and Importunity of the People, encouraged therein by Revelation, but no mention of his Ordination; only it is said, the People did it with the common consent of the Bishops thereabouts^x.

^{*} Euseb. l. 6.

c. 10.

^x Cap. 11.

"Severus Bishop of Milevis in his Life-time appointed his Successour, and acquainted the Clergy with it, but not the People, great disturbance was feared thereupon, &c.

For a Bishop to appoint his Successour was both against the ordinary practice and rules of the ancient Church.

Church. It is prohibited by divers Synods, and particularly by that at *Antioch*^a. But *Severus* committed another error, not acquainting the People with it, and this was like to be of dangerous consequence, *thereupon great disturbance was feared*. St. *Austin* himself shews his dislike of this Omission; *Minus aliquid factum erat, unde nonnulli contristabantur; Something was neglected, at which divers were grieved*. And what was that? *Ad Populum non est locutus*; He spake not to the People of it. But *Austin* coming amongst them, took care to make up this defect, by prevailing with the People for their consent and approbation, as himself tells us; otherwise *Severus* might have been defeated of his designed Successour. St. *Austin* would not run into such a Mistake, but when he desired a Successour, calls the People together, propounds *Eradius*, and obtains for him a fair Election by the People, with their Subscriptions, signifying their approbation of him, and *that they willed and desired what Austin propounded*, as appears by divers Expressions in that Epistle b.

a Can. 23. in
Code 102.

b Epist. 110.

“So *Paulus* the *Novatian* Bishop at *Constantinople*, “appointed his Successor *Marcianus*, to prevent the “Contentions that might happen after his death, and “got his Presbyters to consent to it.

But the designed Successour was neither ordained, nor admitted till the People had declared their desire and approbation of him; *that is*, till they had chosen him. For three dayes after the death of *Paulus*, the Paper wherein he expressed his desire that *Marcian* should succeed him, being opened before the People (a great multitude) *they all with one voice declare aloud that he was worthy*; which amounts to no less than an unanimous choice of him c. And after this *Marcian* being found out, he was ordained and installed. So that

c Socrat. Hist.
Lib. 7. Cap. 46.

that the *Novatians*, though on another account they pass for *Schismatics*; yet are not found, no, not in this singular Instance (of a Bishops designing his Successour) to vary from the practice of the *Catholicks*, in admitting the people to chuse their own *Pastor*.

Thus far we can find no evidence, that either for the preventing of *supposed Inconveniencies* or other accounts, any Bishop was settled in a Church without the Choice of the People. Let us next see what *Canons* were made for the *regulation of Elections* so as to bereave the People of this Privilege, or diminish their Power.

“The *Greek Canonists* are of opinion that the Council of *Nice* took away all Power of Election of Bishops from the People, and gave it to the Bishops of the Province.

Those Canonists (if any beside *Balsamo*) were herein greatly mistaken, as most learned men judge and prove; nor do I think the *Dr.* is of another mind. If he had thought the reasons of this conceit to be of any force, he would have produced them. That this Council was far from excluding the People from the Power of chusing their Bishops, is apparent enough by their *Synodical Epistle* to those of *Alexandria* and *Egypt*, where they declare their judgments, that if any Bishops de cease, others reconciled to the Church may be admitted in their room, if they be worthy, *εἰ δὲ ἀσθενῶσι, καὶ τὸ πλῆθος αὐτοὺς ἐκλεῖξαι θέλῃ*.^d

d In Socrat.
l. 1. c. 6.

“It is apparent from the Council of *Antioch*, that Bishops were sometimes consecrated without the consent of the People, for it doth suppose a Bishop after consecration may not be received by his People.

The question is not, whether the Election went before

fore the Ordination or followed, but whether any Bishop might have the Chair, and be possessed of the Bishoprick without the Peoples Consent. This Canon doth not suppose that he might, but rather on the contrary ; It plainly signifies, that *the People might refuse a Bishop after he was consecrated* ; and in that case, by the Canon he may retain the Honour and Office, but the Place he comes not at. For that was a rule in the ancient Church religiously observed, and the violation of it counted intolerable ; *Sicut antiqui Canones decreverunt, nullus invitis detur Episcopus* ^{e Con. Auvl. 3.} ; *As* ^{Can. 11.} the ancient Canons have decreed, let no Bishop be offer'd to the People without their Consent. Such Ordinations of Bishops whom no Church desired, were not usual, but by the Council of Chalcedon they are plainly forbid, and declared to be Nullities. ^{f Cas. 6.}

Out of another Canon he would shew that the Consecration of a Bishop, was not then performed in his own Church.

It was so by ancient Custom, as Cyprian declares, and also by later Canons, the Bishop was to be ordained among his own People ^{g Con. Auvl. 4.} ^{Can. 8.}. Whether it be so or no by this Canon is not material, since Elections by the People are not at all concerned in it.

“ Gregory subscribed at Antioch, as Bishop of Alexandria, before ever he went thither.

The way wherein Gregory proceeded to that Bishoprick, is utterly condemned by the most eminent Bishops in all parts, that were not Arians ; particularly in the West by Julius at Rome ^h, in the South by Athanasius of Alexandria ⁱ, in the East by Nazianzen ^k. It was an irregular and turbulent act of the Arians, such were they who at Antioch made Gregory Bishop, and then sent him with Military Power to Alexandria, to take possession by force of Arms, and expell the great Athanasius.

† Socrat. l. 7.
c. 10, 11.

nafius. If instances had not been very scarce, this would have been waved¹.

“ So St. *Basil* mentions his Consecration of *Euphronius* to be Bishop of *Nicopolis*, without any consent of the People before.

If St. *Basil* did constitute *Euphronius* without the previous consent of the People, which was not usual; yet he did not offer to settle him in the Chair, till he had gained the consent and Approbation of the Synod and People, as the *Dr.*'s words (*but he persuades the Senate and People to accept of him,*) do plainly signify. But indeed St. *Basil* doth not say, that his consecrating of *Euphronius* to be Bishop of *Nicopolis*, was without any consent of the People before, (though the *Dr.* would have it so,) nor find I any thing in that Epistle to prove it. *Basil* there signifies the contrary when he saith, *The People judged him worthy, and the Bishops consented*, (*αὐτὸν ἔβουλον καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι συνέθεντο*), which imports that the People first declared their approbation and desire of him, and thereupon the Bishops consented to ordain him. Its true, he saith, what the Governours do in Church Affairs, have their Confirmation (*βεβαιώται*), from the People, and so wishes them to receive the Bishop given them. But a Bishop was ordinarily given them, i. e. ordained for them, upon their antecedent desire to have it so. This the *Dr.* knows, and signifies in the next words.

“ If the People did agree upon a Person to be Bishop, their way then was to Petition the *Metropolitan* and his *Synod*, who had the full Power either to allow, or refuse him.

The usual way was, after Synods were settled by Rule (as they were in the Fourth Age) for the People when they wanted a Bishop, to meet together

ther, and Chuse one whom they thought fit, by unanimous Consent, or the Major Vote of the Clergy and People; and then to draw up a *Writing* with the *Subscriptions* of the Electors, called by the *Latines* *Decretum*, and by the *Greeks* *ὑπόγραφα*, and sending this to the Synod, thereby signified whom they had Chosen, with a desire that he might be ordained; which done, the Consecrators, Metropolitan or other Bishops, had *no Power* at all to refuse the Person Elected, if he was duly qualified; and in case he was not, they had *no Power* to put another upon them, but only to advise them to proceed to the Choice of another, as might be made manifest by unquestionable Authorities^m. Yea such deference had they for *Elections* by the People, that if they had *Chosen* one who was *uncapable* by the *Canons*, if the *incapacity* could any way be removed, the Election was allowed, and the Ordainers proceeded upon it. This is evident in the Election of *Eusebius*, at *Casarea*, and *Nectarius* at *Constantinople*, and *Ambrose* at *Millan*; who were Chosen by the People to be Bishops in the places mentioned, not only before they were *Ordained*, but before they were *Baptized*, yet the Elections stood good, and being *Baptized* first, and after *Ordained*, they were admitted to those Bishopricks.

"It is evident from the Twelfth Canon of *Laodicea*, that although all the People chose a Bishop, "if he intruded himself into the Possession of his *See*, "without the Consent of a Provincial *Synod*, he was "to be turned out or rejected by them. Which "shews how much the business of *Elections* was "brought into the Bishops *Power* in the *Eastern* parts.

I find nothing of this in *that* or any other Canon of that *Synod*, but there is some such thing in the

^m Greg. Lib. 6.
Ep. 38. Lib. 7.
Ep. 34. Lib. 8.
Ep. 40. Dis. 62.
15.

Sixteenth Canon of the Council at Antioch, and the reason of it was, lest an unworthy Person should intrude into a Bishoprick, the Synod was first to be satisfied of his sufficiency; but then if he was found qualified according to the *Canons*, the Synod had no power to withhold him from those by whom he was Chosen, nor to Chuse another for them if they judged him incapable. Thus the business of *Elections* was no more brought into the *Bishops Power* in the *Eastern* parts (where he intimates their Power herein was greatest,) than the business of *Ordinations* was brought into the *Peoples Power*; for if the *Bishops* could put him by who was unworthy, though the People had *Chosen* him; so the People might refuse him whom the *Bishops* *Consecrated*, if they were not satisfied in him; nay more, for the *Bishops Power* was limited to the Case of the *Candidates* insufficiency, but the People might refuse a Person commended by the *Bishops* as sufficient, if they did not like him on other accounts. The consequence of *Ordaining* One for the People, or putting one upon them whom they desired not; was intolerable in the judgment of the *Ancient Church*. *Leo*, a Bishop of greatest Reputation in his time, thus expressed it. *Nullus invitis, & non petentibus ordinetur*, Let no Bishop be Ordained for those who are unwilling, and do not desire him. And the Reason wherewith he enforces it, is very considerable; since it is not only an Argument for those times, but extends to all ages, and leaves it not tolerable at any time, *Nè plebs invita Episcopum non optatum aut contemnat aut oderit, & fiat minus religiosum quam convenit, cui non licuerit habere quem voluit*; Lest the People not consenting, do either contemn or hate a Bishop whom they desire not; and become less Religious than they should be, when they may not have such a one as they would have.

Let

Let me only add, that those who have any respect for *Modern Bishops*, such as get Possession of their *Sees*, without regard either of the Peoples Choice or the Consent of a *Provincial Synod*, ought to be ware of this Canon; since it leaves them no more Title to any Episcopal Chair, than *Bassianus* and *Stephanus* had to that at *Ephesus*, when upon this account, they were ejected by the Sentence of the *Fathers* at *Chalcedon*, and the greatest Council that the Ancient Church ever had.

“By the law of *Justinian*, the common people were “excluded from elections of Bishops, and the Clergy and “better sort of Citizens were to nominate *three* to “the *Metropolitan*, out of which he was to chuse “one.

The Law of that *Emperour* enjoyns, that the Clergy and better sort of Citizens do draw up the *electing decree*, (*Ἐπιστάματα ποιῆν*.) but doth not enjoyn that the other Citizens be excluded from concurring in the *Election* or to make any without their liking. In the Code we have another of his Laws, where it is enacted; *that the choice be made παρὰ τῶν ἀκόντων τὴν πόλιν* ^{ο, ο De Episcopis.} *by the Inhabitants of the City*, in general, without any ^{Lex 42.} discrimination. Nor doth the former *constitution* oblige them precisely to chuse and present *three*, they have liberty by it, if they find not *three* sufficient persons (and none appointed to be Judges thereof but themselves) to name *two* or but *one*.

“By the Canon of *Laodicea*, the common people “were excluded from the power of chusing any in- “to the Clergy, for they were wont to raise tumults “upon such occasions.

That Canon, in Bishop *Bilsons* judgment, concerns only Presbyters P: The meaning of it is this, that it is ^{P. Vbi supra} not fit Elections should be left to the rabble (*οἷος*) on- ^{c. 15. P. 342.} only

only or chiefly, without the Clergy and better sort of the people, who may keep the rest in order, and prevent tumults. The import of the words *ἐκτρέφειν* and *ὀφθαλμοὶ* lead us thus to understand it; and the sense and practice of the Church every where at that time, expressed in the *Councils* and the *best Writers* of that age, wherein the *Synod* was held, will not suffer us to take it in any sense, exclusive of the interest of the *common people* in the choice of their Pastors; unless we will have it to be a singular *capricio* of a few Bishops in this Assembly, in opposition to the common sentiments of the *Christian World*.

q *Can.* 3.

“The second Council of *Nice* restrained the elections only to Bishops q, pag. 323.

The third Canon of that Council determines, that the *Magistrates appointing* of Bishops is a nullity; confirming it by an ancient Canon (one of those which pass'd for *Apostolical*.) But that clause whereby *Bellarmino* and others will have elections restrained to Bishops is mistaken, *ordinations* being thereby intended, not *elections*; which is apparent because they cite for it the *fourth Canon* of the first Council of *Nice*, in which *Episcopal Ordinations* are appropriated to Bishops, but nothing expressed, or intimated concerning *Elections*. Thus is this passage alledged by the *Dr.* understood by Bishop *Bilson*^r; and thereby all advantages are cut off which others would make of it, against elections by the people.

r *Ibid.* pag. 369

The eighth Council of *Constantinople*, might as well have been spared, *confirming* neither the *former*, nor any thing else for the *Dr.*'s purpose, though it be said *the people are here excluded with an Anathema*. It is well the *curse* came no sooner, than towards the latter end of the *ninth* Age. But what if that *Synod* never *anathematized* any such thing? The Ca-

non

non cited for it is the twenty eighth, which in other Latin Copies is the twenty second, but the *Greek Edition* hath but fourteen in all ; and the *Greek Church* (whose Council it was) owns no more ; so that this *Canon* looks no better, than a piece of (some *Latins*) forgery.

I need not add that this Synod was ten years after condemned, by a far more numerous Council at the same place. *Baronius* gives a full account of it, though with such reflexions upon *Photius* and his adherents as is suitable to his usual partiality. But it seems there is great scarcity of Evidence when this Canon and that of the *second Nicene* Council cited immediately before, must be made use of: seeing this leaves the way of making Bishops now used amongst us, under a *Curse* ; the other makes our Bishops however consecrated to be no *Bishops*, and will have those debarred from communion who *communicate* with them. And this is considerable, as grounded upon an ancient Canon. Indeed it was the sense of the ancient Church for many Ages, if we may judge thereof by Councils or Writers in those Ages, not only that Bishops ought to be chosen by the people, but that none ought to be owned as Bishops who were not so chosen.

“The fourth thing he would have considered is, “that when there were Christian Magistrates, they “did interpose in this matter as they judged expedient.

He brings many instances, I shall begin with those which seem less pertinent, and so proceed to the rest.

“After the Death of *Alexander* Bishop of *Constantinople*, the People fell into Parties, some were for “*Paulus*, and others for *Macedonius* ; the Emperour “*Constantinus* coming hither puts them both by, and
“ap-

"appoints *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia* to be Bishop there.

The *Arians* were so hot and violent for the promoting of their *Party*, that they transgressed the *Rules* and *Usages* of the Church, trampling on all that stood in their way. This did *Constantius*, and his Design was utterly to subvert the *Christian Faith* in that main Fundamental of it, concerning the *Eternal God-head of Christ*^s.

^s *Socrat.* l. 6.
c. 7.

In order hereto he thrust out those, who according to the Rule and Order of the Church, were *duly Chosen* by such who adhered to the true Faith, particularly *Paulus*; and gives the *Chair* to *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, the *Antesignanus* of the *Arians*, and one who by his great Interest, subtle Counsels, and mischievous Actings, did more propagate *Arianism*, than *Arius* himself: and afterwards gives order that *Paulus* be banished, and that *Macedonius*, one as bad or worse than *Eusebius*, should have the Chair, *not according to the Rule of the Church, but by the will of the Governour*, as the *Historian* Notes^t, and his way is made to it through the Death of three Thousand one Hundred and Fifty of the People. Now this is scarce a *proper Instance*, for that was proposed to be given in *Christian Emperours*, but the *Arians* were not counted *Christians*. *Athanasius* proves they ought not to be so called in divers *Orations*^u, and *Constantius* was an *Arian*, indeed a great Zealot for promoting of that *Hereſie*, and suppressing the True Faith. He banished the *Orthodox Bishops*, ſaith *Theodoret*^w. He made a Law for the utter demolishing of their Churches, ſayes *Socrates*^x. He commanded *Athanasius* to be kill'd, and proposed rewards to those that would assassinate him; and raised a *general Persecution* against the Professors of the True Faith, *much like to those under the Heathen Emperours*, ſayes *Sozomen*^y. What such

^t *Idem.* Cap. 16.

^u *Orat.* 1. 2.
4.

^w *Lib.* 2.C.15.

^x *Lib.* 4.cap.32.

^y *Lib.* 4.c.13.14.

such a *Prince* did against the Rule and Practice of the True Church, and the Rights of the Faithful People in *Elections*, will rather commend them, than be any prejudice to them.

"When *Athanasius* was restored, *Constantinus* declared it was by the Decree of the Synod and by his *Consent*, and he by his Authority restored likewise *Paulus* and *Marcellus*, &c.

But to what purpose is this alledged? Is there no difference between *Chusing* and *Restoring*? How did *Constantinus* interpose for the *hindring* of the Peoples Elections, by *Restoring* those Bishops, who were before duly Chosen by the People? Their Choice hereby is rather countenanced and confirmed. I can discern no Reason why it is made use of against it. There seems to be neither Proof nor Pertinency in these Instances.

"After the Death of *Sisinnius*, the Emperour declared that to prevent disturbance he would have none of the Clergy of *Constantinople* Chosen Bishop there, and so *Nestorius* was brought from *Antioch*.

But his being brought from *Antioch*, is no Proof that he was not Chosen by the People; for *Chrysostome* was brought from the same place, and was none of the Clergy of *Constantinople*, more than *Nestorius*, yet was called thither and placed in the *Chair* by the *Votes of the People*, as will appear presently. And why should it be thought *Nestorius* was not Chosen by the People? Doth *Socrates*, cited as giving this account of him, say he was not? No, but he doth not mention his Choice. Nor doth he speak a word of his *Ordination*, shall we therefore conclude that he was neither Elected nor Ordained? If this were an Argument, there are Hundreds that we must account Bishops, without either Ordination or Election. But though there be no Reason why we should think that *Nestorius* was not Chosen, yet there is apparent Reason, why the Choice should not be mentioned. For an unanimous Choice by the People was an Honour, and wont to be put among the

Encomiums of worthy Bishops. But *Nestorius* after he got the Chair, answered not their expectation, but shew'd himself worthy of an ill Character, both by his Actions and Judgment; and so in fine was Condemned as a *Heresick* by a general Council at *Ephesus*, and banished by the Emperour. Thereupon the *Historian* might think himself concerned to wave that, which was much for the Honour of one who so little deserved it.

There are *Three* or *Four* Instances which seem more pertinent, and considerable, which I have therefore taken the Liberty to put together; but indeed there is some mistake in them, I would not say they are misrepresented.

"So *Constantine* did in the Church of *Antioch*, when there was great Dissention there, upon the Deposition of *Eustathius*, he recommended to the Synod *Euphronius* of *Cappadocia*, and *Georgius* of *Arethusa*, or whom they should judge fit, without taking any notice of the Interest of the People.

But how doth it appear that *Constantine* took no notice of the Interest of the People? No otherwise, but because *Sozomen* speaks not of it. Of what weight this Argument is we have seen before. But what if another Author declare that he did take notice of it? *Eusebius*, who knew the whole Matter as well and better than *Sozomen*, being particularly concerned therein; tells us plainly that *Constantine* did, in his Letters to the People of *Antioch*, take notice of the Peoples Interest in the Choice of their Bishop. For, sayes he, the Emperour advises them not to desire the Bishop of another Church (in reference to *Eusebius*, whom they had a mind to, though he was then Bishop of *Cæsarea*) but according to the Customs, or Decree of the Church, to Chuse one to be their Pastor, as the Common Saviour did direct them,

2. Euseb.
De vita
Constant.
lib. 3. c. 57.

ὁμοῦ ἐκκλησίας τῶν διψήσαντων ποιῆσαι.² And in the Emperour's Epistle there are divers expressions which signifie no less.

"When *Gregory Nazianzen* resigned the Bishoprick of *Constantinople*, *Theodosius* commended to the Bishops the
"care

"care of finding out a Person, who recommending many to
 "him, the *Emperour* himself pitched upon *Nectarius*, and
 "would have him made Bishop, &c.

If this will any way serve the purpose for which it is alledged, the *Emperour* must pitch upon *Nectarius*, so as to have him made Bishop *without any previous Choice* of the People; but there's no ground for this, nay, there's clear and unquestionable evidence against it. For the *General Council* at *Constantinople*, in the latter end of their *Synodical Epistle* to the *Western Bishops*, declared that *Nectarius* was Chosen by the *Suffrage of the whole City*. We have, say these Fathers, ordained *Nectarius*, with the unanimous concurrence of this *œcumenical Synod*, all the *Clergy*, and all the *City* giving their Voices for it,

πᾶσις ἐπιτηρομένης τῆς πόλεως α.

a In Theodor. Hist. lib. 5. cap. 9.

"When *Chrysostome* was chosen at *Constantinople*, the Royal Assent was given by *Arcadius*, the election being made, saith *Sozomen*, by the people and Clergy, but *Palladius* gives a more particular account of it, &c. pag. 324.

About the Choice of *Chrysostome* to *Constantinople*, *Sozomen* sayes, the *Clergy* and *People* having Voted it, ἡμετέροις δὲ τῷ τῷ λαῷ καὶ κλήρῳ, the *Emperour* gave his Consent. *Socrates* sayes, That by the common Decree, Ἀποφασίᾳ κοινῇ, of the *Clergy* and *People*, the *Emperour* sent for him to *Constantinople* b. But *Palladius* gives a more particular Account, sayes he: Yet in that Account and the words cited for that purpose, there is nothing at all which denies that *Chrysostome* was thus unanimously chosen by the people. Now shall we believe that *Chrysostome* was not thus chosen upon the testimony of *Palladius*, who doth not deny it; against two credible Witnesses who positively and expressly affirm that such was the choice? To these might he added the *Writers* of the life of *Chrysostome*, particularly *George* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, who as *Photius* declares, made his collections out of *Palladius*, among others c.

b Lib. 6. cap. 2.

"So that there was no antecedent election of the people, as *Sozomen* sayes, but whatever there was, was subsequent to the *Emperours* determination.

c In Chrysost. Tom. 2. pag. 183.

Sozo-

Sozomen is here contradicted without ground and to little purpose. Whether the election was antecedent or no, is not material; since the Emperours determination was neither against nor without the peoples Choice; yet evidence is produced for the election as antecedent, and none at all against it.

Maximianus being dead, he gave order that *Proclus* should be made Bishop before the others body was buried.

Maximianus being dead, the Emperour, (*inspired* is the *Historians* word,) permitted *Proclus*, so that if he was not chosen, the Emperour interposed not there, by positive order, but by permission only. But indeed *Proclus* in an election before had the voices of the Major part for him, and so had carried it, but for a groundless suggestion that the *Canons* did forbid it. This being but about two years before, the place was again void by the death of *Maximianus*, and the sense and desires of the people for *Proclus* being sufficiently known by their late Suffrages, a new election was not needful, but he admitted to be installed without more ado.

Thus we have made it manifest, that all these instances are not sufficient to shew, that any one truly Christian Prince did from the first think fit, upon any occasion, to make use of their Authority, either to deprive the people of their power in Elections, or to obtrude any Bishops upon the Churches without the Peoples Choice. As for *Constantius*, being an *Arian*, the ancient Church did not esteem him a Christian, *Hillary* makes bold to call him *Antichrist*. And what he did to the prejudice of the peoples Priviledge herein, since it was done to promote *Arianism* and for the subversion of the Christian Faith, is little more to be regarded, or drawn into example, than if *Julian* had done the like in favour of *Heathenism*.

The two last heads concern only the usages of latter times, which I had no design to take notice of.

FINIS.